

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 7, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met, in executive session, at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We know, our Father, that there is a time to speak and a time to keep silence. Help us to tell the one from the other. When we should speak, give us the courage of our convictions. When we should keep silence, restrain us from speaking, lest, in our desire to appear wise, we give ourselves away. Teach us the sacraments of silence, that we may use them to know ourselves, and, above us, to know Thee. Then shall we be wise. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the legislative proceedings of Thursday, April 3, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John Wesley Thompson Falkner IV, of Mississippi, to be United States marshal for the northern district of Mississippi, vice Ira Lamar Morgan, term expired.

By Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Public Lands:

Edgar E. Witt, of Texas, to be Chief Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission; William M. Holt, of Nebraska, to be Associate Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission; and

Louis J. O'Marr, of Wyoming, to be Associate Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission.

CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is in executive session, and the pending question is the confirmation of the nomination of David E. Lillenthal to be Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator what his program is so far as proceeding with the question of the confirmation of the Chairman and members of the Atomic Energy Commission and the General Manager thereof?

Mr. WHITE. As I understand the situation, there are a number of Senators on the other side of the aisle, and some on this side, who are unable to be here today. Most of those on the other side of the aisle have been away participating in Jefferson Day meetings, and I felt the courtesy should be accorded them of passing from the Lillenthal nomination today and proceeding with legislative business. I should be happy to see an effort made to arrive at a decision for a vote on the Lillenthal nomination tomorrow, if the Senator would make such a request.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, I do not know that I have any objection to the motion made by the Senator from Maine, and I understood on last Thursday that the situation would be as stated by the Senator. I am not objecting to the proceeding as suggested by the Senator from Maine with this reservation, that I earnestly hope that the Senate will agree to come to a vote on the question of the confirmation of the pending nominations some time tomorrow.

I am not prepared to urge a unanimous-consent agreement at this moment, but I should like to suggest to the Senator that I may want to suggest such an agreement later today, and I do not want to foreclose my right by keeping silent and not stating what I have in mind.

Mr. WHITE. I hope the Senator from Iowa will proceed in his efforts to secure a vote on the Lillenthal nomination. I suppose I have been as much opposed to his nomination as has any other Senator, but I think the time has come when we ought to dispose of the matter, and we ought to dispose of it at the earliest possible moment. However, I want to accord, as I think all of us want to accord, to our colleagues who are necessarily absent today such courtesy as the situation permits. I very much hope that in the latter part of the afternoon the Senator from Iowa will submit a unanimous-consent request fixing a time for a vote, and I hope that the Senate will agree to the request.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, let me say that I would rather not make the request at this moment, but I should like to have an understanding with the Senator that it will not be considered out of order, so to speak, if I make the request and attempt to get an agreement later this afternoon.

Mr. WHITE. I will say for myself that I shall join in any effort the Senator may see fit to make pointing to a vote tomorrow or as soon thereafter as possible.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I have no objection to the motion the Senator now makes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of legislative business.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor and Federal Security of the Committee on Appropriations, I ask unanimous consent that my subcommittee may meet this afternoon, commencing at 2:30 o'clock, to hold a hearing on the apprentice training service and the Bureau of Labor Statistics appropriation requests.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and permission is granted.

MEETING OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit for a short time this afternoon, owing to the fact that some persons from Alaska are present and desire to be heard.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, permission is granted.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

RECORD OF JUDGMENT AGAINST GOVERNMENT BY DISTRICT COURT (S. Doc. No. 28)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a record of judgment rendered against the Government by the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York in a special case as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which requires an appropriation of \$186.75 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (S. Doc. No. 29)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Department of Justice to pay a claim for personal injuries in the sum of \$50, which has been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of March 20, 1936 (31 U. S. C. 224b), and which requires an appropriation for its payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, WAR DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 30)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the War Department to pay claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death in the sum of \$39,244.51, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of July 3, 1943 (31 U. S. C. 223b), and which require an appropriation for their payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATION ALLOWED BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. Doc. No. 31)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of appropriation amounting

to \$4,330,782.14, to cover claims allowed by the General Accounting Office and for the services of the several departments and independent offices (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SCHEDULE OF JUDGMENTS BY COURT OF CLAIMS (S. Doc. No. 32)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which has been submitted by the Treasury Department and requires an appropriation for payment, amounting to \$48,487.87 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENT AGAINST GOVERNMENT BY DISTRICT COURT (S. Doc. No. 33)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation for payment of a judgment rendered against the Government by the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York, amounting to \$4,000 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, NAVY DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 34)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for death or personal injury to residents of Guam, in the amount of \$61,478.26, which have been considered and adjusted under provisions of the act of November 15, 1945, Public Law 224 (59 Stat. 582), and which require an appropriation for payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RECORDS OF JUDGMENTS AGAINST GOVERNMENT BY DISTRICT COURTS (S. Doc. No. 35)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, records of judgments rendered against the Government by United States district courts, as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which require an appropriation of \$3,957.57, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest and costs (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, NAVY DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 36)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death, in the sum of \$29,148.24, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of December 28, 1945, Public Law 277, Seventy-ninth Congress, and which require an appropriation for payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, PUBLIC ROADS ADMINISTRATION (S. Doc. No. 37)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Public Roads Administration to pay claims for damage to roads and highways of States or their subdivisions, in the sum of \$19,366.89 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. Doc. No. 38)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Department of the Interior to pay a claim for damage to or losses of private owned property, in the sum of \$75, which has been considered

and adjusted under the provisions of the act of December 28, 1922 (31 U. S. C. 215), and which requires an appropriation for payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PAYMENT OF CLAIM FOR PERSONAL INJURY AND DAMAGE TO PROPERTY (S. Doc. No. 39)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the War Department to pay a claim on account of damage arising out of personal injury and damage to privately owned property occasioned by Army personnel in a foreign country, in the amount of \$8,000, which has been considered and adjusted under the act of January 2, 1942, as amended (31 U. S. C. 224d), and which requires an appropriation for payment (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION, WAR DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 40)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an estimate of appropriation under the War Department for payment of certain claims allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to \$14,408.74 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED PROVISION PERTAINING TO APPROPRIATION FOR NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD (S. Doc. No. 41)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision pertaining to an appropriation for the fiscal year 1946 for the National War Labor Board (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATION PASSED BY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AND THE MUNICIPAL COUNCILS OF ST. CROIX, AND ST. THOMAS AND ST. JOHN, V. I.

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, the Municipal Council of St. Croix, and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John, V. I. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Lands.

CONTROL AND ERADICATION OF FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on cooperation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease for the 30-day period ended March 30, 1947 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CIVILIAN WAR BENEFITS PROGRAM

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to transfer to the Employees' Compensation Fund the payment of benefits in certain cases arising under the Civilian War Benefits program (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Ore-

gon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas it is possible to maintain livestock in health in the United States only by exercising vigilance to prevent the incidence and spread of communicable diseases of such livestock; and

"Whereas there is now prevalent in Mexico a highly contagious, infectious, and injurious disease of cattle and other livestock known as epizootic apthra, or more commonly, hoof and mouth disease; and

"Whereas there is urgent necessity for preventing the spread of such disease across the international boundary line to livestock in the United States; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact legislation authorizing and enabling the United States to cooperate with the Republic of Mexico in checking the spread of said disease of livestock, and authorizing the Department of Agriculture of the United States through its Bureau of Animal Industry, and other appropriate Federal departments and bureaus, to render expert advice and practical assistance to the Republic of Mexico for the purpose of controlling and eradicating communicable diseases of cattle and other livestock; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and he hereby is directed to send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President and the Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives in the Congress from the State of Oregon."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 19

"To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the processing and marketing of crab meat is an important industry of the Pacific Coast States and Alaska that is capable of supplying the needs of the United States for such product, if given a fair opportunity so to do; and

"Whereas the importation of foreign crab meat has hampered the development of this industry and will, if unrestricted, seriously curtail and impede the growth and development of an important industry of the Pacific Coast States and Alaska: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact legislation reasonably restricting the importation into the United States of foreign crab meat, and defining that term to include not only crab meat produced in foreign waters, but also crab meat produced, processed, canned, marketed or distributed by foreign nationals outside the United States and Alaska; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be and he hereby is directed to send copies of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President and the Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of Congress from the State of Oregon."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Enrolled House Concurrent Resolution 3

"Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to enact legislation appropriating funds to continue the Rural Electrification Administration and provide funds for loans to rural electric cooperatives

"Whereas Congress is now in session and is considering the amount of funds, if any, to appropriate for continuance of the rural electrification program; and

"Whereas the record of rural electric cooperatives is one of outstanding service and achievement and is a wholly self-liquidating enterprise with several million dollars paid back in advance of schedule; and

"Whereas Oklahoma is in great need of the continuance and extension of the REA program: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma (the Senate concurring therein):

"SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to enact such legislation as shall continue rural electric cooperatives in operation and to enable them to extend service to all additional rural communities in the United States as is practicable on a self-liquidating basis.

"SEC. 2. That the speaker of the house of representatives be and he is hereby directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee of said United States House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Oklahoma delegation to Congress.

"Adopted by the house of representatives the 3d day of March 1947.

"Adopted by the senate the 20th day of March 1947."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Senate Joint Resolution 11

"Joint resolution memorializing Congress to authorize the issuance of public-improvement bonds of the Territory during the years 1947 to 1951, inclusive, without regard to the limitations imposed by the Hawaiian Organic Act

"Whereas the public-improvement program of the Territory was interrupted by the war; and

"Whereas no improvements have been financed by Territorial bond issues for many years, the last such issue having been September 1, 1939; and

"Whereas during said period the Territory of Hawaii not only has sold no new issues of bonds for public improvements, but also has reduced its bonded indebtedness from the amount of \$38,966,000, the amount of said bonded indebtedness as the same stood after the issuance of said public-improvement bonds of September 1, 1939, to \$11,079,000 as of March 1, 1947, the legislature having appropriated for the reduction of said bonded indebtedness the sum of \$5,850,000, in addition to the regular appropriations for the sinking fund, by act 8 of the sessions laws of Hawaii, 1945; and

"Whereas the postwar requirements of the Territory for public improvements far exceed the amount obtainable from current taxes, and the limitations imposed by section 55 of the Hawaiian Organic Act would unreasonably defer the accomplishment of such improvements, which the necessities of war have already too long deferred; and

"Whereas it is the desire of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii to issue, over a 5-year period, public-improvement bonds of the Territory for necessary projects, without regard to the limits imposed by section 55 of the Hawaiian Organic Act, provided the total

indebtedness of the Territory is not extended beyond \$35,000,000: Now, therefore, be it enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii:

"SECTION 1. The Congress of the United States is hereby requested to authorize the issuance by the Territory of Hawaii, during the years 1947 to 1951, inclusive, any provisions of the Hawaiian Organic Act or of any act of Congress to the contrary notwithstanding, of public-improvement bonds in any amount, provided the total indebtedness of the Territory shall not at any time be extended beyond \$35,000,000 by reason of such authorization, and any extension of the total indebtedness of the Territory beyond such amount shall be made only in conformity with the Hawaiian Organic Act. Such bonds shall be serial bonds, payable in substantially equal annual installments, the first installment to mature not later than 5 years and the last installment to mature not later than 30 years, from the date of issue thereof. No such bond shall be issued until approved by the President of the United States.

"SEC. 2. Duly authenticated copies of this joint resolution shall be transmitted to the Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, the Secretary of the Interior, and each of the two Houses of the Congress of the United States.

"Approved this 29th day of March A. D. 1947.

"INGRAM M. STAINBACK,

"Governor of the Territory of Hawaii."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

"House Joint Memorial 13

"To the Congress of the United States, the Department of the Interior, the Department of Justice, the Governor of Alaska, and the Delegate from Alaska:

"Whereas an investigation has been made of the decline in the productivity of the Alaska Salmon Fisheries, including consultation with officials of the Fish and Wildlife Service, the Alaska Salmon Industry, Inc., the United Trollers of Alaska, and representatives of other fishermen's unions and the Cold Storage Industry in Alaska; and

"Whereas for the past 3 years there has been a rapid and continuous decline in the salmon taken in the waters of southeastern Alaska, and particularly in the northern half of southeastern Alaska, with the result that the earnings of fishermen have been seriously affected, and the industry as a whole does not expect any improvement unless some very drastic changes are made. Although the earnings of those engaged in the industry have not declined to the extent indicated by the reduction in the catch, this fact has been due entirely to the high price of fish on the markets of the United States; and

"Whereas with the resumption of normal supplies of meat and other products, the industry is faced with a serious financial problem which will affect the whole economy of the Territory of Alaska and particularly the economy of the coastal cities and villages. The Fish and Wildlife Service does not have an adequate research program for the purpose of accumulating facts on a scientific basis which are necessary for a complete rehabilitation of the industry and the promulgating of the regulations under which it operates. Other problems of similar magnitude have been solved with respect to the halibut fisheries and the sockeye run on the Fraser River of British Columbia. The Fish and Wildlife Service has long recognized the need for an adequate research program and is unable to obtain the necessary appropriation for a long-range program of the intensity desired; and

"Whereas some phases of the life cycle of the salmon are a complete mystery to those engaged in the industry, and it is generally believed that among other things, tagging

programs should be resumed and research conducted with respect to the effect of temperature changes in the water. It is alleged by all fishermen that present conservation and regulatory measures are aimed at those salmon which escape the traps and are headed for the spawning beds. Since this type of regulation jeopardizes the livelihood of thousands of fishermen and injures the industry as a whole, the Fish and Wildlife Service is urged to extend its study of the salmon migrations and its conservation regulations from the spawning beds to the territorial limits of our offshore waters. Particular and immediate attention should be given to the restoration of our early runs of salmon, and to an honest examination of our present regulations to the end that such regulations bear upon all types of gear with equal force; and

"Whereas it appears that the most important factor in the decrease of the salmon run in this area has been caused by violations of the fishing regulations with respect to the various types of gear employed regularly in the industry, and particularly with respect to the use of seines, chicken wire, and dip nets in taking salmon from closed areas at the mouths of streams while the salmon are congregating before ascending the streams. This condition has been aggravated and the number of violations generally have increased because of the scarcity of salmon in areas open to fishing and the high prices since 1941 for all varieties of salmon. In order to effectively patrol the streams and apprehend violators, substantial increases in the appropriations for these activities must be obtained. In the Juneau district, which comprises the northerly half of southeastern Alaska there are 1,500 miles of coastline closed to fishing, but these areas are scattered through 4,500 miles of coastline comprising the district; and

"Whereas the Fish and Wildlife Service is now patrolling the area with two boats, two aircraft, which are both in need of repair at the present time, and about five stream watchmen. The Service has lost many valuable men who have found it more profitable to resign and engage in other activities. Necessity is shown for 5 boats, 3 aircraft and about 50 watchmen for the Juneau area alone for the purpose of preventing illegal fishing and the apprehension of violators. Sufficient funds have not been made available for a patrol program of this size which is needed for the protection of the industry. Adequate provision of funds has not been made to permit the inspection of fish buyers' records and the inspection of fish purchased at the buying stations. Many violators can be apprehended and placed under suspicion by such inspection, for the fish caught in seines have net marks upon them and the fish caught in streams are discolored. Such inspection would prevent the sale of fish after the seasons have been closed and after those caught during the open season are sold; and

"Whereas the program of licensing fishing boats by means of metal licensing plates was suspended during the war, but should be resumed for the purpose of ready identification and a tabulation of the number of persons using each type of gear; and

"Whereas it has been suggested that individual licenses be provided with space for recording violations and that there be a law requiring such record. It has also been suggested that if present penalties are unenforceable that they be changed in such manner and to such extent that violations shall be unprofitable without depriving the violator of his means of livelihood:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist urges, because of the necessity for immediate corrective measures to restore the salmon industry to its former productivity, that appropriate legislative and administrative steps be taken to correct the present critical situation as above indicated and that an immediate

budget of \$1,000,000 for carrying out an effective enforcement program be appropriated by Congress as a wise investment in the preservation, expansion, and planned utilization of the Nation's great salmon fisheries resource. "And your memorialist will ever pray."

A letter in the nature of a petition from Emily Greene Balch, Wellesley, Mass., praying an appropriation of \$71,030,000 as the American share of the International Refugee Organization; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Supreme Lodge, Order Sons of Italy in America, Washington, D. C., favoring postponement of the consideration of the treaty with Italy until such time as the treaty with Germany shall have been concluded; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Petitions of the Fourth Congressional District Townsend Council of the State of Florida and the West Palm Beach Townsend Club No. 1, both in the State of Florida, praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend plan providing old-age assistance; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Bar Association of the Territory of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H., favoring continuation of paying additional compensation to the Supreme Court Justices and the judges of the circuit court, in an amount at least equal to the additional compensation now provided by law, until such time as the Congress acts favorably upon House bill 854, or any similar legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLIKIN:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Joint Memorial 11

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to provide funds for the completion of the Leadville drainage tunnel

"Whereas there is a threatened shortage of base metals throughout the United States which causes considerable distress among our people and industries and especially among those using base metals; and

"Whereas the Leadville, Colo., district is noted for its great reserves of base metals as shown by past production records and present mining activity in that district; and

"Whereas a deep drainage tunnel for the Leadville area has long been advocated by the State of Colorado through its various mining agencies over a period of years; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States, as one of the war-emergency measures, by Public Law No. 133, approved July 12, 1943, appropriated \$1,400,000 for the construction of the Leadville drainage tunnel, which sum is to be repaid to the Department of the Interior by those operating mines drained and benefited by said tunnel; and

"Whereas although said sum, excepting approximately \$35,000, has been spent, the Leadville drainage tunnel is now only half completed; and

"Whereas if said tunnel is not completed, the money heretofore spent thereon will be completely lost and those operating the mines in that area will be unable to repay the money already spent on said tunnel; and

"Whereas because of the fact that said tunnel will assist in making available vast mineral reserves to be used in the event of future emergency, the completion thereof should not be delayed until such emergency is imminent or has occurred; and

"Whereas the said tunnel is urgently needed to serve not only the best interests of the Leadville area and the State of Colorado, but will also serve the entire United States and its industries, and when completed will be of material aid in reconversion, and in obtaining full production of scarce metals: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Thirty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Colorado (the Senate concurring herein), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby memorialized to approve the continuation and completion of the Leadville drainage tunnel, and to appropriate sufficient funds therefor; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of memorial be transmitted to the President of the United States, to the chairmen of the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Colorado in the Eightieth Congress of the United States."

By Mr. ELLENDER:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Resolution 8

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to restore to the Bureau of Customs the funds cut from its 1947-48 appropriation by the National House of Representatives, so that the customs port patrol can continue to exercise its proper functions in safeguarding the national welfare

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana that, as a result of a cut of \$3,505,000 in the funds allotted to the Bureau of Customs in the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, as passed by the House of Representatives of the United States, the collector of customs for the district of New Orleans has been ordered by the Bureau to dismiss in his district 74 out of 88 port-patrol officers, leaving the port of New Orleans and the support of Baton Rouge open to completely uncontrolled importation of contraband, as well as removing a great measure of control over lawful imports; and

"Whereas it is understood that similar action is being taken at all other seaboard ports in the United States; and

"Whereas this action, in effect, repeals many of the provisions of the Tariff Act and other protective legislation, as the customs port patrol is the principal agency guarding our ports against smuggling of all kinds; and

"Whereas the welfare of every man, woman, and child in the United States is directly affected when the bars against the illicit importation of narcotics, contraceptives, abortives, aphrodisiacs, immoral and subversive literature, firearms and dangerous drugs and undesirable aliens are let down; and

"Whereas the guarding of vessels in American ports is the principal function of the customs port patrol, for the very purpose of preventing such illicit importations; and

"Whereas the Congress, from time to time, has wisely legislated against the importation of dangerous articles and commodities, and has imposed customs duties upon acceptable imports, both to raise revenue and to protect the American farmer, worker, businessman, and manufacturer, who cannot maintain the American standard of living and still compete in an open world market with coolie and, in certain instances, forced (or prison) labor; and

"Whereas the majority of importers, ship-owners and operators, masters, officers, seamen, and others connected with them are honest and will obey the law without strict surveillance, there remains a lawless minority, ready to turn a dishonest dollar at every opportunity, and this minority is the only class which will benefit through the elimination of the controls over vessels and imports, exercised since the foundation of the Republic by the customs; and

"Whereas the necessity for economy in Government is fully recognized by every citi-

zen, but any attempt at economy which strikes at the foundation of the social structure and imperils the revenue is a false economy; and

"Whereas the need for such a drastic step as the liquidation of the vital service performed by the customs port patrol is questionable, when it is considered that many nonessential agencies, in whole or in part, are still operating; and

"Whereas the welfare and adequate protection of the American people are of paramount importance to our national legislators: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of Louisiana, That the Legislature of Louisiana do respectfully request and recommend to the Congress of the United States that the funds deleted from the appropriation for the Bureau of Customs be restored, so that the necessary functioning of the customs port patrol can continue unimpaired; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Louisiana be, and he hereby is, directed to send a certified copy of this resolution to the President of the United States; the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States; the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and to each member of the Louisiana delegation in the Congress of the United States."

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.)

By Mr. MORSE:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Joint Senate Memorial 4

"To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas there is urgent need for the establishment of a Federal institution for the training of diplomats, economic advisers, and military attachés in the Foreign Service of the United States, to the end that the representatives abroad of the United States may be prepared to meet the responsibilities of their offices; and

"Whereas the Honorable LOWELL STOCKMAN has introduced into the House of Representatives H. R. 1770, which provides for the establishment and maintenance of an academy for the instruction and training of students in the theory and practices of international and diplomatic relations, to be known as the United States Foreign Service Academy; and

"Whereas the enactment of H. R. 1770 will meet this Nation's growing and obvious need for the training of personnel in its Foreign Service: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of Oregon (the House of Representatives jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact H. R. 1770, to the end that an academy may be established for the training of personnel in the Foreign Service of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be, and he hereby is, directed to send a copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, to the President and the Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the State of Oregon."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 15

"To the Honorable Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Oregon, in legislative session assembled, most respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas under the present acts of Congress and regulations governing the collection of certain Federal income taxes, it was provided that prisoners of war held in the Philippine Islands and certain other territories were exempted from a portion of the Federal income tax; and

"Whereas the terms of such actions discriminated against prisoners of war who had been removed from the possessions of the United States for internment in Japan and in other localities; and

"Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States certain legislation proposing an amendment to section 251 of the internal revenue act; and

"Whereas in fairness to the prisoners of war who were removed from or interned in the possessions of foreign countries, some legislation should be passed placing such prisoners upon a status similar to that providing for prisoners interned in the possessions of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to pass such legislation as will result in providing for prisoners interned in foreign countries a status similar to that provided for prisoners of war interned in the possessions of the United States; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Oregon."

By Mr. WHITE:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; ordered to lie on the table:

"Resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President

"Whereas the Eightieth Congress of the United States of America, at the first session begun and held at the city of Washington on Friday, the 3d day of January 1947, by a constitutional two-thirds vote in both Houses adopted a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to wit:

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. No person shall be elected to the office of the President more than twice, and no person who has held the office of President, or acted as President, for more than 2 years of a term to which some other person was elected President shall be elected to the office of the President more than once. But this article shall not apply to any person

holding the office of President when this article was proposed by the Congress, and shall not prevent any person who may be holding the office of President, or acting as President, during the term within which this article becomes operative from holding the office of President or acting as President during the remainder of such term.

"SEC. 2. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress": Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Maine hereby ratifies and adopts this proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Maine notify the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States of this action of the legislature by forwarding to each of them a certified copy of this resolution."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine, identical with the foregoing, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Memorials of sundry citizens of Westfield and Caribou, Maine, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 265, to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DEVELOPMENT OF MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a copy of a resolution I have received from Mr. Paul A. Schneider, secretary of the Niobrara River Basin Development Association, in behalf of an uninterrupted program for the development of the Missouri River Basin, and particularly that part known as the Niobrara River Valley.

This basin-wide development, as the Senate knows, was authorized by Congress in 1945, and it is the judgment of a vast majority of our people that the best economy for the Nation as a whole will be served if Congress makes available adequate appropriations so that work on the development of the Missouri basin resources can proceed on schedule.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

MISSOURI LEGISLATURE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. KEM] and myself, I present Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 5, which was adopted by the senate of Missouri on March 7, 1947, and concurred in by the house of representatives of the State of Missouri on March 28, 1947. I ask that the resolution be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks, and that it be appropriately referred.

I read the last paragraph of the resolution:

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the General Assembly of the State of Missouri, in its sixty-fourth regular session assembled,

respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States of America that H. R. 1759, introduced by Representative REEVES, of Missouri, or any other suitable and appropriate legislation be enacted permitting division of income between husband and wife for income tax purposes by the citizens and residents of all of the States of the United States.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

Whereas an inequality exists between citizens and residents of the several States of the United States, in that residents of 9 States having community property laws are privileged to divide incomes between husband and wife for income tax purposes, thereby reducing the income taxes required to be paid by said residents, which privilege is being denied to the residents of 39 States not having community property laws; and

Whereas by reason of the premises legal privileges are enjoyed by a minority of the citizens of the United States of America, solely determined by residence, which are not permitted to all the citizens of the United States; and

Whereas it is within the power of the Congress of the United States of America to correct such inequality by adopting suitable and appropriate legislation therefor: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring therein), That the General Assembly of the State of Missouri, in its sixty-fourth regular session assembled, respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States of America that H. R. 1759, introduced by Representative REEVES, of Missouri, or any other suitable and appropriate legislation be enacted permitting division of income between husband and wife for income tax purposes by the citizens and residents of all of the States of the United States; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be dispatched to the United States Senators and Congressmen from Missouri.

CASH PAYMENT OF GI TERMINAL LEAVE—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, a concurrent resolution adopted by the South Carolina State Legislature requesting the National Congress to pass legislation for the immediate cash payment of GI terminal-leave pay heretofore issued in nontransferable bonds.

I should like to point out further to the Members of this body that there is at present pending before the Senate Committee on Armed Services a bill, S. 102, introduced by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and myself, which would authorize the Treasury Department to cash these bonds at the option of the holder. It seems to me this is purely and simply a matter to grant by law simple justice, in that it would give to the enlisted personnel of the armed forces the same privilege and rights which have been enjoyed by officer personnel. It is my hope that that committee will see fit to report this bill to the Senate for action in the immediate future.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Concurrent resolution requesting the National Congress to pass legislation for the immediate cash payment of GI terminal-leave pay heretofore issued in nontransferable bonds

Whereas the National Congress of the United States of America, by legislation duly passed, issued to enlisted men of World War II terminal-pay nontransferable bonds for their services as rendered; and

Whereas these veterans in the United States could more acceptably use such pay in the readjustment period in so many ways; and

Whereas there is now pending in the National Congress a number of bills to make immediate cash payment of these terminal-pay bonds to the veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the General Assembly of South Carolina hereby requests the National Congress of the United States to give as early attention as is practicable to the payment of the terminal-pay bonds heretofore issued to veterans of World War II; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Members of the National Congress from South Carolina urging immediate attention and assistance with this pending legislation; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution also be sent to the President of the Senate of the United States and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the legislative committee of the American Legion and to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, all in Washington, D. C.

(The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.)

INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGE ADVERTISING

Mr. BUTLER. I present and ask to have printed in the RECORD three petitions relating to interstate transportation of alcoholic beverage advertising. Following each petition I should like to have the first name printed and the number of other signers given thereafter. On one petition there are 39 names, on another there are 30, and on another there are 71.

There being no objection, the petitions were received and the first name on each petition and the number of signatures were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAUSA, NEBR., March 30, 1947.

HON. WHERRY and BUTLER,
Senators of Nebraska,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: We, the undersigned citizens of Wausa, Nebr., do hereby petition you, our representatives in Washington, to be sure to vote for Senator ARTHUR CAPPER's bill, known as S. 265, to prohibit the advertising of intoxicating liquor in newspapers, magazines, and over the radio.

C. T. NELSON
(And 39 others).

PETITION

To our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We respectfully request that you use your influence and vote for the passage of S. 265,

a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio. The most pernicious effect of this advertising is the constant invitation and enticement to drink. The American people spent \$7,770,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1946 as compared with \$3,700,000,000 in 1942. During the same period there was a corresponding increase each year in crime. There is every reason why this expenditure should not be increased, but decreased.

LETTA SEXSMITH
(And 30 others).

O'NEILL, NEBR.

PETITION

To our Senators and Representatives in Congress:

We respectfully request that you use your influence and vote for the passage of S. 265, a bill to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce and the broadcasting of alcoholic-beverage advertising over the radio. The most pernicious effect of this advertising is the constant invitation and enticement to drink. The American people spent \$7,770,000,000 for alcoholic beverages in 1946 as compared with \$3,700,000,000 in 1942. During the same period there was a corresponding increase each year in crime. There is every reason why this expenditure should not be increased, but decreased.

MRS. VELMA PFEIFER
(And 71 others).

GORDON, NEBR.

SUPPRESSION OF COMMUNISM IN AMERICA—LETTER FROM UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, from time to time the statement has been made that our institutions of higher education are in many instances giving sympathetic accord to communistic doctrines. I lend no emphasis by expression to that statement, however frequently it may be made. At least one institution of higher education, from its own standpoint, has seen fit, over the signatures of its faculty, to express itself and request its representatives in Congress to stamp out communism in America by whatever means Congress may see fit to employ. The University of Nevada, sending a communication to the two Senators from Nevada, has made known its attitude by way of a letter over the signatures of the respective members of its faculty, requesting that action be taken to stamp out communism in America, saying, among other things:

No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and Stalin.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter addressed to the senior and junior Senators from Nevada be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA,
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
AND POLITICAL SCIENCE,
Reno, Nev., March 14, 1947.

Senator PATRICK A. MCCARRAN.
Senator GEORGE W. MALONE.
Representative CHARLES H. RUSSELL.

HONORABLE SIRS: We, the undersigned, respectfully urge your support for any movement made in Congress looking to the outlawing of the Communist Party and to the

circumscribing otherwise of Communist activities in this country.

The paramount allegiance of all American and other Communists is to Soviet Russia, not to the United States. Says William Z. Foster, president of the American Communist Party: "The workers of this country and the workers of every country have only one flag, and that is the Red flag"; and again, "The unconditional support of Soviet Russia is still the main duty of the Communists of all countries." (See J. Edgar Hoover.)

Says a former Communist, Benjamin Gitlow, twice Communist candidate for Vice President of the United States: "Soviet Russia was our fatherland, its Red army our army, its Red flag our flag. Patriots of Soviet Russia, we would not hesitate to commit any act of violence or treason against the country in which we lived * * *. We became the most ardent agents of the Soviet Government and were prepared to render any service it might require of us."

An argument against outlawing the Communist Party may be to the effect that such action would drive the Communists underground. Well, that is where their chief work is done at present—in labor unions and in politics.

The argument may be raised that to outlaw the Communist Party would be to infringe upon constitutional rights of free speech, of the press and of assembly. But, certainly, the fundamental law of the land was never intended to be constituted the instrument for the overthrow by force or by subversion of the very government for which it provides.

Again, quoting Gitlow: "The typical American Communist regards himself * * * as an important cog in the world-wide Communist machine that serves the Soviet Government. He is compensated for his opposition to the United States Government by being impressed with its importance to the Government of the Soviet Union."

Again, we—the undersigned, urge you to use your influence and your votes in Congress for the outlawing of communism and of its activities in the United States. "No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and Stalin."

Respectfully yours,

Charles Roger Hicks; B. F. Chappelle, Head, Department of Foreign Languages, University of Nevada; C. C. Smith, Associate Professor, Historical and Political Science; Harold N. Brown, Professor of Education; Ralph A. Irwin, Professor of Psychology; Theodore H. Post, Professor of Music; Edward G. Sutherland, Associate Professor of Economics; F. W. Tranter, Dean, School of Education; Louis Titus, College of Agriculture; Stanley G. Palmer, Dean, College of Engineering; Everett W. Harris, Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering; Frederick Wood, Dean, College of Arts and Science; G. W. Sears, Professor and Head of Department of Chemistry; Frederick W. Wilson, Director of Residence Teaching; Alden J. Plumley, Assistant Professor of Economics; Austin E. Hutcheson, Associate Professor of History and Political Science; Phillip G. Auchampaugh, Associate Professor of History and Political Science; J. E. Martie, Head, Department of Physical Education; William C. Miller, Department of English; Reuben C. Thompson, Professor of Philosophy.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. AIKEN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to which was referred the bill (S.

907) to provide for the orderly transaction of the public business in the event of the death, resignation, or separation from office of regional disbursing officers of the Treasury Department, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 91) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 1057. A bill for the relief of William D. Norris; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1058. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. William Trebing; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1059. A bill for the relief of William F. Thomas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S. 1060. A bill for the relief of Joseph Dobos; and

S. 1061. A bill for the relief of Sherman White; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECTON:

S. 1062. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Christine West and Mrs. Jesse West; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1063. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to permit coverage thereunder of employees of States and their political subdivisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1064. A bill relating to the payment of travel expenses of officers and employees of the Post Office Department and postal service; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1065. A bill to amend subsections (c) and (d) of section 19 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN (by request):

S. 1066. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to reclassify the salaries of postmasters, officers, and employees of the postal service; to establish uniform procedures for computing compensation; and for other purposes," approved July 6, 1945; to the Committee on Civil Service.

EXTENSION OF FARM-LABOR-SUPPLY PROGRAM—AMENDMENT

Mr. KNOWLAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm-labor-supply program, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

EXEMPTION FROM ADMISSIONS TAX FOR ADMISSIONS TO AGRICULTURAL FAIRS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BALDWIN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 684) to provide for exemption from the admissions tax for admissions to agricultural fairs which are conducted with financial aid from States or political subdivisions thereof, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

REDUCTION OF INDIVIDUAL INCOME-TAX PAYMENTS—AMENDMENT

Mr. HOLLAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1) to reduce individual income-tax payments, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

JEFFERSON DAY ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT TRUMAN

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD the address delivered by the President of the United States at the Jefferson Day dinner at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D. C., on Saturday evening, April 5, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My fellow Democrats, our meeting together this evening carries forward an old party custom. In this annual tribute to the memory of Thomas Jefferson, we, who are members of the party he founded—the Democratic Party—take great pride and feel deep satisfaction.

We know that as long as we remain free the spirit of Thomas Jefferson lives in America. His spirit is the spirit of freedom. We are heartened by the knowledge that the light he kindled a century and a half ago shines today in the United States. It shines even more strongly and steadily than in his time. What was then an untried faith is now a living reality.

But we know that no class, no party, no nation, has a monopoly on Jefferson's principles. Out of the silence of oppressed peoples, out of the despair of those who have lost freedom, there comes to us an expression of longing. Repeated again and again, in many tongues, from many directions, it is a plea of men, women, and children for the freedom that Thomas Jefferson proclaimed as an inalienable right.

When we hear the cry for freedom arising from shores beyond our own, we can take heart from the words of Thomas Jefferson. In his letter to President Monroe, urging the adoption of what we now know as the Monroe Doctrine, he wrote:

"Nor is the occasion to be slighted which this proposition offers of declaring our protest against the atrocious violations of the rights of nations by the interference of any one in the internal affairs of another."

We, like Jefferson, have witnessed atrocious violations of the rights of nations.

We, too, have regarded them as occasions not to be slighted.

We, too, have declared our protest.

We must make that protest effective by aiding those peoples whose freedoms are endangered by foreign pressures.

We must take a positive stand. It is no longer enough merely to say, "We don't want war." We must act in time—ahead of time—to stamp out the smoldering beginnings of any conflict that may threaten to spread over the world.

We know how the fire starts. We have seen it before—aggression by the strong against the weak, openly by the use of armed force and secretly by infiltration. We know how the fire spreads. And we know how it ends.

Let us not underestimate the task before us. The burden of our responsibility today is greater, even considering the size and resources of our expanded Nation, than it was in the time of Jefferson and Monroe. For the peril to man's freedom that existed then exists now a much smaller earth—an earth whose broad oceans have shrunk and whose natural protections have been taken away by new weapons of destruction.

What is the responsibility that we must assume?

Our responsibility is to stand guard before the edifice of lasting peace which, after so long a time, is at last being built.

That edifice is the United Nations.

The functions of the United Nations is to quench the flames wherever they may break out; to watch throughout the world and extinguish every spark that comes from a dif-

ference between governments; to do this, if possible, through the machinery of peaceful arbitration, but to do it in any case. This is so, even if armed conflict must be prevented by the use of an international police force.

We believe that formula is sound and workable. Our faith in it is strong and resolute. The United Nations is man's hope of putting out, and keeping out, the fires of war for all time. In supporting the United Nations we must, when necessary, supplement its activities. By aiding free nations to maintain their freedom we strengthen the United Nations in the performance of its functions.

The foreign policy of this country transcends in importance any other question confronting us. It would be fatal if it were to become the subject of narrow political consideration.

Our foreign policy must not be wrecked on the rocks of partisanship.

United support of a policy that serves the interests of the Nation as a whole must be our aim.

I wish to commend the efforts of those members of both parties who have worked, side by side, to achieve this goal.

To meet the responsibilities placed upon us today this Nation must be strong. A strong United States means a country that maintains a military power commensurate with its responsibilities. It means a country of sound domestic economy. It means a country that holds its place in the forefront of industrial production and continues its leadership in creating the techniques of abundance. And it means, most of all, a strong, united, confident people, clear in the knowledge of their country's destiny, unshaken and unshakable in their resolve to live in a world of free peoples at peace.

No matter how great our military potential may be, military potential alone is not enough. It is necessary that we maintain sufficient military strength to convince the world that we intend to meet our responsibilities.

Now, what of our domestic economy? How strong are we at home?

As we appraise our domestic scene—our mighty array of factories, mines, farms, producing at or near capacity, and with employment at an all-time high—our doubts, if we had any, are put to rest. We are viewing a panorama of prosperity—such prosperity as no generation of Americans before us ever experienced.

You may recall hearing dire predictions, in the last year and a half—predictions that the United States was heading into an economic crack-up, predictions of glutted markets, of a great deflationary plunge. It is significant that the most pessimistic cries of calamity came from men who had little confidence in our American system of free enterprise.

They were wrong in their predictions. They were wrong because they do not understand the strength of our system of free competitive enterprise. Under that system, each man is free to go where he likes, to follow the calling of his choice, and to be rewarded in proportion to the productivity of the effort or the property he contributes. Insofar as we insure that each individual has the opportunity and inducement to make the largest contribution he can to this country's total production, we not only strengthen our Nation against any possible encroachments, but we also set an example to all other peoples of the desirability of free government in the economic as well as the political sense.

Our country's financial stamina was tested in the recent war as it had never been tested before. But in spite of the tremendous cost of the war, we emerged with our financial leadership in the economic world greater than ever before. Beyond making our best effort to eliminate waste in the conduct of the war, the cost of the war was

not a matter within our power to control. We emerged bearing a burden of debt, representing that cost, and what we do with that burden is a question of tremendous import, but fortunately it is a question that we have the power to decide for ourselves.

The first decision that we made was to reduce Federal Government spending as quickly as possible.

The extent of retrenchments by the Government is shown by the record.

In the fiscal year 1945 the Federal Government spent \$100,000,000,000. In 1946 we cut expenditures to \$64,000,000,000. In 1947 we have further reduced expenditures to an estimated figure of \$42,000,000,000. The budget for the next fiscal year, which I have sent to the Congress, totals \$37,500,000,000.

Not only have we greatly reduced expenditures, but we have made tremendous progress toward the elimination of deficits.

In the fiscal year 1945 the Federal Government had a deficit of over \$53,000,000,000. In the fiscal year 1946 it was in the red by about \$2,000,000,000. But now we have worked our way into the black, and I am happy to be able to say tonight that for the present fiscal year 1947 we shall balance the budget and we shall have a surplus.

I am determined that stringent economy shall govern all peacetime operations of the Government.

When the several departments and agencies were called upon, a few months ago, to submit their requests for funds for the coming fiscal year, they were told of my determination.

They responded by eliminating many of their former activities. This was not enough. When the estimates were in, I went over them, making further substantial reductions. When I finished, these department estimates had been reduced by a total of some \$7,000,000,000 under their original level.

I was warned by some that I was going too far. I was aware of the risk. But I was aware, too, of the greater risk of a weakened postwar financial structure. I knew that in the public interest, sacrifices of some Government services had to be made.

The result was a budget of \$37,500,000,000. That figure marked the border line beyond which we could not reduce the activities of our Government without entering the area of false economy. In other words, further so-called economies would not have been economies at all. They would merely have meant curtailment of services that would cost our taxpayers—all taxpayers—more than the reduction in cost that appeared on the surface.

You, my fellow citizens, are properly cautious of false economy in your daily lives. If the foundation of your house needs repair, or if the roof leaks, you know that you are wasting money, not saving it, by failing to make that repair.

So with government. If we abandon our work of reclamation, of soil conservation, of preserving our forests, of developing our water resources, we are wasting money, not saving it. If we cease our vigilance along the borders of our country and at our ports of entry, we are wasting money, not saving it. If we falsely economize by reducing the staff of men and women who audit tax returns, or who increase the country's productivity by settling labor disputes, we are wasting money, not saving it. If we cut down the effectiveness of our armed forces, we run the risk of wasting both money and lives.

Any substantial reduction of the 1948 Federal budget, as submitted to the Congress, must be clearly understood by the American people as a venture into false economy. To the extent that we countenance any such reduction, we shall weaken our own house by our refusal to keep it in basic repair. At best, this is poor judgment. At worst, it is an invitation to disaster.

The second decision we must make, affecting the strength and health of our economy,

concerns the public debt. We must resolve to begin the long process of reducing that debt, which represents a large part of the cost of winning World War II. That debt amounts to almost \$2,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

In deciding whether we shall start substantial payment on the debt, or whether we shall reduce taxes instead, we are deciding a question which will affect the future of every one of us. Our decision will affect the number of jobs in the future, the wages men and women will earn, what those wages will buy, and how much our savings, our insurance, and our bonds will be worth.

We, as a nation, are now having prosperous years. This is the time when we must start paying off the debt in earnest. When a man is earning good wages, and at the same time owes a lot of money, he is wise if he uses his excess income to pay off his debts. He would be short-sighted if he cut his income just because he was not spending it all at the moment. When the people, through their government, owe a lot of money—as we do today—it is the course of wisdom to make payment on our debt. It would be extremely short-sighted to cut down the Federal revenue without making a real effort toward debt reduction.

I recognize frankly, that the present burden of taxation on our people is too heavy to be considered as permanent, and at a proper time I will support tax reduction and tax readjustment designed to reduce the burden and to adjust that burden to the needs of a peacetime economy.

In further evaluating the strength of our domestic economy, I must express to you my deep concern over the level of prices prevailing today. A system of free enterprise does not automatically work out its own adjustments without our giving thought to the process.

The main factor that can weaken our economy at this time is our own selfishness—the kind of selfishness which is now expressed in the form of unnecessarily high prices for many commodities and for many manufactured articles. These prices must be brought down if our entire economy is not to suffer.

With the exception of a very few items, all price controls have been removed. But freedom from such controls, like other freedoms, cannot be abused with impunity. A profound moral responsibility rests upon those citizens whose decisions have widespread effect on our markets—to put it simply, the responsibility of playing fair, of not going whole hog for profits. The alternative is inflation, industry priced out of the market, and, eventually, men priced out of their jobs.

The world today looks to us for leadership. The force of events makes it necessary that we assume that role.

This is a critical period of our national life. The process of adapting ourselves to the new concept of our world responsibility is naturally a difficult and painful one. The cost is necessarily great.

But it is not our nature to shirk our obligations. We have a heritage that constitutes the greatest resource of this Nation. I call it the spirit and character of the American people.

We are the people who gave to the world George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

We are a people who not only cherish freedom and defend it, if need be with our lives, but who also recognize the right of other men and other nations to share it.

While the struggle for the rights of man goes forward in other parts of the world, the free people of America cannot look on with easy detachment, with indifference to the outcome.

In our effort to make permanent the peace of the world, we have much to preserve—much to improve—and much to pioneer.

As we strive to reach the fulfillment of our quest we will do well to recall the words to Thomas Jefferson:

"I have sworn, upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT—LETTER AND MEMORANDUM FROM R. S. SMETHURST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the body of the RECORD a letter and a memorandum which I have received from Mr. Raymond S. Smethurst, counsel of the National Association of Manufacturers, in regard to amendments to the Wagner Act.

There being no objection, the memorandum and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS,

Washington, D. C., March 13, 1946.

Hon. WAYNE MORSE,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I have read with a great deal of interest your address before the Senate on March 10, 1947. It was a very thorough and thoughtful presentation.

I was particularly interested in your discussion of the separation of functions in NLRB and the changes in Board procedures resulting from enactment of the Administrative Procedure Act. Referring to these changes, you said:

"These changes were presented and discussed at a meeting with the leading attorneys from all parts of the country, including representatives of the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Federation of Labor, the CIO, independent unions, and private firms of attorneys who frequently have business with the Board. No substantial complaints have been heard regarding the Board's procedures insofar as separation of functions is concerned."

Members of our law department staff participated in these conferences, and later on we submitted a memorandum covering several rather important requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act which had been omitted from the revised rules of procedure. As you will note from the attached copy, most of these deficiencies related to the separation of functions.

In all fairness, I should add that in December 1946 the Board filed with the Federal Register some amendments to its general statement of procedures (not its Rules of Procedure), covering some of the points referred to in the attached memorandum. This statement of procedures is merely descriptive and does not have the legal status of the formal Rules of Procedure. Consequently, until the Board's formal rules are amended, we feel there still remain substantial complaints that the Board has failed to conform to the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act.

For your information I am attaching a copy of the Board's printed rules and regulations, which, you will note, became effective September 11, 1946, in advance of the conferences to which you referred. These printed copies were distributed to those in attendance at the conference, so that the Rules and Regulations were an accomplished fact before any opportunity was presented for comment or suggestion.

I apologize for writing at such length, but I did want the record to show that, on behalf of the National Association of Manufacturers, we did register the complaint that the Board's rules did not recognize the separa-

tion of functions to the extent called for by the Administrative Procedures Act.

With kindest personal regards, I am,
Sincerely yours,

R. S. SMETHURST,
Counsel.

MEMORANDUM RE NLRB REVISED RULES AND THE ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

The object of the Administrative Procedure Act is "To improve the administration of justice by presenting fair administrative procedure." This purpose is to be achieved by making available to the public certain information relating to administrative agencies and by establishing certain minimum procedural requirements in the conduct of agency functions. The act, as stated by the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, "is a comprehensive charter of private liberty and a solemn undertaking of official fairness."

It was stated at the November conference that the Board's customary practices meet the standards of procedure required by the Administrative Procedure Act. It is not the purpose of this memorandum to examine the strict legal adequacy of the revised rules of NLRB. Rather it is intended to suggest wherein the rules may not conform to the letter or the spirit of the act. "The act," said Senator McCARRAN, "is intended as a guide to him who seeks fair play and equal rights under law, as well as to those invested with executive authority" (Senate Document No. 248, p. iii).

If the act itself is intended as a guide, it is not unreasonable to assume that Congress intended agency regulations to be an encyclopedia of procedural rights and duties of Board agents, as well as of parties before the Board. Congress, however, must necessarily establish broad principles of administrative fair play and leave the complete implementation of those principles to the agencies. As stated by the House committee, "The general public is entitled to know agency procedures and methods or to have the ready means of knowing with certainty." It is to this objective of according complete information to the general public that the following comments are directed.

AFFIDAVITS OF PREJUDICE

Section 7 (a) of the APA provides the voluntary disqualification by a trial examiner and for the good faith filing of a timely affidavit of prejudice against such examiners.

No reference to these provisions appears in the revised rules. It would seem that the rules should advise parties of their rights in this regard and establish procedures for the orderly effectuation of the right. Moreover, a provision stating the right of examiners voluntarily to disqualify themselves would be conducive to a greater feeling of independence on the part of such officers.

SUBSTITUTION OF TRIAL EXAMINERS

Section 5 (c) of the act provides, in part, that the same officers who preside at the reception of evidence shall make the recommended or initial decision except where they become unavailable to the agency. Section 203.29, however, provides that trial examiners may be substituted at any time. It falls to specify under what circumstances and at what stage of the proceedings substitution will be permitted.

EVIDENCE

Section 203.32 of the revised rules, in conformity with section 10 (b) of the National Labor Relations Act, provides that the rules of evidence shall not be controlling. The rules do not, however, direct examiners to exclude irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious evidence as contemplated by section 7 (c) of the Administrative Procedure Act. Moreover, the rules do not expressly embody the further provision of section 7 (c) that the proponent of an order shall have the burden of proof.

INTERMEDIATE REPORTS

Section 203.38 of the revised rules provides for an intermediate report by the trial examiner who is to make recommendations as to the disposition of the case based on the record. He is not expressly directed to base his findings and conclusions upon the whole record as supported by and in accordance with the reliable, probative, and substantial evidence as provided in section 7 (c) of the APA. In other words, he is not directed impartially to weigh the entire evidence pro and con a particular issue and reach his conclusion in accordance with the preponderance of the credible evidence. (See H. Rept. No. 1980 on S. 7, the Administrative Procedure Act, p. 37.)

Neither does the rule expressly direct the examiner not to consult any person or party on any fact in issue unless upon notice and opportunity for all parties to participate as required by section 5 (c) of the act providing for the separation of agency functions.

DECISIONS

Section 7 (d) of the Administrative Procedure Act provides in part: "Where any agency decision rests on official notice of a material fact not appearing in the evidence in the record, any party shall on timely request be afforded an opportunity to show the contrary." However, the revised rules do not establish procedures to be followed by any party seeking to avail himself of the right granted in section 7 (d).

DECLARATORY ORDER

Section 5 (d) of the Administrative Procedure Act authorizes the Board, in its sound discretion, to issue declaratory orders to terminate a controversy or remove uncertainty. The revised rules, however, fail to provide procedures to be followed by persons seeking such orders.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

At the conference held on November 7 and 8 it was pointed out that Board attorneys felt the Administrative Procedure Act "is not intended to expand or substantially change existing law as to judicial review." While the scope of judicial review is not deemed relevant to a discussion of agency rules of procedure, it is perhaps pertinent to observe that we have serious reservations as to the correctness of the expressed opinion.

LAW DEPARTMENT,

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF

MANUFACTURERS,

Washington, D. C.

Submitted to National Labor Relations Board under date of November 29, 1946.

CANCER TREATMENT AND RESEARCH— ADDRESS BY FLEET ADM. ERNEST J. KING

MR. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a very able address on the cancer problem and the need for adequate funds for cancer research. The address was delivered by Fleet Adm. Ernest J. King at Trenton, N. J., on March 31, 1947.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor and a privilege to be asked here tonight to participate in the opening of the 1947 campaign to raise funds in New Jersey for cancer treatment and research.

It may seem somewhat presumptuous on my part to speak on the subject of what should be done to carry out the plan to control and to cure cancer. However, I can repeat the information furnished me as to what has been done and what is in the making. Much of this information may well be already known to you—in which case I

invoke the dictum that repetition is a form of emphasis. And I can say, in my own behalf, that although I have been in the Navy for nearly 50 years, I have been—and am—a fellow citizen—and a fellow taxpayer.

I find that it is a common practice to open such a talk as this with a story. I have one which I hope may be appropriate to what I have to say. At the Tehran Conference December 1942, at the first round-table meeting between Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Churchill, and the Marshal Stalin there was a temporary lull after seats were taken. Mr. Roosevelt broke the ice by suggesting, through his interpreter, that the Marshal Stalin might wish to make some opening remarks. The Marshal Stalin's response, through his interpreter, was no, that he'd rather listen. Mr. Roosevelt then spoke for about a minute on the purpose of the Conference, what it meant in the successful conduct of the war, by closer association among the Allied Powers, and what it might well mean to the future of the world. He passed the conversational ball to Mr. Churchill who talked in his best form for 6 or 7 minutes. Then everybody present looked at the Marshal Stalin—he had to say something. He spoke to his interpreter who then stood up and said, "The Marshal Stalin says that he subscribes to those sentiments." Then, gulping, "The Marshal Stalin says 'Now let's get down to business.'"

The American Cancer Society is a nationally recognized organization founded some 30 years ago. It is the sole Nation-wide agency which has for its purpose the collection of funds to be used for the treatment and the research of cancer. Its organization comprises a national headquarters in New York City and divisions of the society incorporated in each of the States and in the District of Columbia. We are met together here tonight as the New Jersey Division. Local chapters operate under charters from the State divisions. This plan is uniform throughout the United States. Of the funds collected, it is the practice that 60 percent is to be used within the State and 40 percent is administered by the national headquarters. Of this headquarters fund, over 40 percent each year is applied to cancer research in institutions, part of them accredited by the National Research Council.

But the strength and effectiveness of the organization for the control and cure of cancer is not solely in the organization for raising and administering funds. An integral part of the State and chapter organizations is the field army which renders such outstanding service to our fellow citizens in the war against cancer. This voluntary service is not only an essential element but also an indispensable part of the work whereby the human touch is brought into play, whereby the gifts of heart and hand do their noble part in the fight for which members are enlisted.

I note the statement that any person is eligible for membership in the American Cancer Society without discrimination or distinctions because of age, sex, race, color, social or economic status, or religious or political belief. What seems not to be stated, but nonetheless clearly implied, is that treatment and service are to be rendered to all regardless of age, sex, race, color, social or economic status, or religious or political belief. Surely this is democracy at its very best.

In the armed services there has been in use for nearly 50 years or so a more-or-less standard method for dealing with military problems which, incidentally, has the merit that it can be used in meeting any problem of whatever kind. In brief, the method is called Estimate of the Situation and consists of analyzing the problem at hand in the following steps:

(a) What is the mission? What are we trying to do?

(b) The enemy—what are his factors of strength and of weakness?

(c) Ourselves—what are our factors of strength and of weakness?

(d) The decision—what shall we do to attain the mission?

(e) The plan—how shall the decision be put into effect?

I shall now essay to estimate the situation in regard to cancer:

The mission is clear: The control and the cure of cancer.

The enemy—cancer—which now claims in excess of 175,000 lives annually in the United States. In New Jersey in 1945, over 7,000 persons died of cancer. Its strength is that it is a fatal disease with no known specific cure. Its weakness is that we are alive to its dangers—that we are determined to overcome it—and that it can be cured in its earlier stages.

Ourselves: Our strength is that we recognize the dangers of cancer, that we are organized to oppose it, and that we have made a fair start in opposing it. Our weakness is that we have not yet done enough.

The decision: While we have conformed to Confucius' maxim, "the longest journey begins with the first step," we must continue to take steps until the journey is completed and the mission accomplished.

The plan: Through the agency of the American Cancer Society to make unremitting war on cancer by adhering to the definition of responsibilities so clearly and ably set forth by the president of the New Jersey division, Mr. George E. Stringfellow. I quote:

"It is the responsibility of the doctors to advise how, where, and for what medical facilities, programs, and services money shall be spent, and

"It is the responsibility of the laymen to raise the money and to administer the funds in accordance with sound business practices."

One may note that these definitions set up a coordinated responsibility which conforms to the well-known tenets of the general principle called division of labor—not that there is a divided responsibility but, I repeat, a coordinated and cooperative responsibility, each doing the part that he is best fitted to do. It is enlightened teamwork.

While note is being taken of services rendered in the war against cancer, mention must be made of our fellow citizens of the medical profession—and their technical assistants—who are doing such valiant work in research, in treatment, and in diagnosis of cancer—as their indispensable and vital contribution in the war we are all pledged to wage—and to win.

Generally speaking, there are four principal needs to be met in the war against cancer. First, perhaps, is the need to educate the people to the danger and, through clinics, to ascertain cancer in its earliest stages, where positive cures are practicable. I myself feel quite sure that this is a case where doing first things first will pay large dividends—educate the public so that cancer can be detected in its earliest stages. It is therefore obvious that the society could well devote a notable proportion of its funds—and of its time and attention—to attaining the earliest possible detection of the onset of cancer in the individual. Second, is the need for clinics and hospitals where treatment can be given to the victims of cancer; for the diagnosis and treatment of cancer, for the services of medical secretaries, nurse follow-up workers, and technicians, and to stimulate and improve bedside nursing care in the homes of cancer patients. Third, but of not less importance is the need for research into the causes and the cure of cancer. It seems to me that in the current situation we have to rely on what are called empirical methods of treatment—methods which are the end result of trial and error. What we must do—and what only intensive research can do—is to find out the specific cause of

cancer—and the specific cure. Fourth, and though last, by no means least, is the availability of funds wherewith to implement the other three needs.

At the moment we here present are concerned with the fourth, perhaps the greatest, need—that for funds. In the 1946 drive, the American Cancer Society raised some \$10,000,000. The goal for 1947 is \$12,000,000. This year, April has been designated as National Cancer month. New Jersey seems to have anticipated April by one day—perhaps with the intent to maintain its eminent position in this essential work.

The New Jersey Division of the American Cancer Society has already made an impressive record. In 1946 the State quota of \$471,600 was oversubscribed 152 percent. Though ninth in wealth among the States, New Jersey was third in total funds raised. Though sixth in income per capita, New Jersey was first in funds raised per capita. The 1946 record speaks for itself and is an inspiration—and a challenge—to you citizens of New Jersey to repeat—and even to better—your record for 1947.

UNIFORM MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE LEGISLATION—INTERVIEW WITH SENATOR CAPPER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a radio interview with him on the subject of uniform marriage and divorce legislation, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHECKS AND BALANCES—ARTICLE BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Checks and Balances," written by him and published in edition of the Christian Science Monitor of April 5, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

CRISIS IN FOREIGN POLICY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAYLOR

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a radio address entitled "Crisis in Foreign Policy," delivered by him on April 4, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOUSING FOR VETERANS—STATEMENT BY HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a statement by Representative HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS on housing for veterans before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, March 20, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROLE OF AMERICA AS WORLD LEADER—ADDRESS BY MRS. ANNE O'HARE MCCORMICK

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address on America's new role as a world leader, by Mrs. Anne O'Hare McCormick, before the annual convention of the Women's Action Committee for Lasting Peace, which appears in the Appendix.]

IRISH CONTRIBUTION TO AMERICA—ADDRESS BY ARCHBISHOP RICHARD J. CUSHING

[Mr. LODGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address on the Irish contribution to America by Most Rev. Richard J. Cushing, D. D., at a dinner of the American Irish Historical Society in Boston, Mass., which appears in the Appendix.]

A MISSISSIPPI STATESMAN—EDITORIAL FROM THE SOUTHERN AGRICULTURIST

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "A Mississippi Statesman," from the April 1940 issue of the Southern Agriculturist, which appears in the Appendix.]

ECHOES FROM CORNFIELD CONFERENCE—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON (IND.) HERALD

[Mr. JENNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Echoes From Cornfield Conference," from the Washington (Ind.) Herald of March 27, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

POWER NEEDS OF THE NORTHWEST—ADDRESS BY PAUL J. RAVER

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an address by Paul J. Raver, Administrator, Bonneville Power Administration, on February 26, 1947, dealing with the power problem of the Northwest, which appears in the Appendix.]

STATEMENT OF POLICY OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE POWER USERS—LETTER FROM HILL WILLIAMS

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a letter addressed to him by Hill Williams, executive secretary of the Pasco (Wash.) Chamber of Commerce, with respect to the statement of policy of public and private power users, which appears in the Appendix.]

NEED FOR OCCUPATION FORCES—LETTER PUBLISHED IN NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a letter under the heading "Need for occupation forces" published in the New York Times of March 13, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

PROSPECTS FOR INDUSTRIAL PEACE—ADDRESS BY EDWIN E. WITTE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "Prospects for Industrial Peace," delivered by Edwin E. Witte, chairman, department of economics, University of Wisconsin, to the Milwaukee County League of Women Voters at Milwaukee, Wis., on February 7, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR-MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS IN 1947—ADDRESS BY EDWIN E. WITTE

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "Labor-Management Problems in 1947," delivered by Edwin E. Witte, chairman, department of economics, University of Wisconsin, at the meeting of the Business and Professional Men's Group of Cincinnati, on March 21, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM M. LEISERSON

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "Government Control of Industrial Relations," recently delivered at Los Angeles, Calif., by William M. Leiserson of John Hopkins University, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CARTEL SYSTEM—ADDRESS BY EDWARD H. LEVI

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "The Cartel System," delivered by Edward H. Levi, of the University of Chicago Law School, before the Chicago Chapter of the New Council of American Business on March 13, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED STATES OF EUROPE—AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. FULBRIGHT obtained the floor. Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I was about to say that I understand the Senator from Arkansas desires to proceed briefly. I merely wish to give notice that at the conclusion of his address I shall ask that the Senate proceed with the calendar, under rule VIII, for the consideration of bills to which there is no objection.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine stated he understood that I desire to proceed briefly. I think I shall take about 20 or 30 minutes. I say that so that he will be under no misapprehension.

Mr. President, the decision the Congress makes on the proposal to extend assistance to Greece and Turkey is, I think, one of the most important the Congress has had to face in the history of this Nation. I hope that the Members of the Senate, especially those who are members of the Committee on Foreign Relations, will debate the pending measure thoroughly and earnestly, so that there can be no misunderstanding as to the meaning of the action we take.

With the information I now have, it is my intention to support the President's proposal. Under our system of government, the President has a particular responsibility in our foreign relations. He has access to information which, in the nature of things, we cannot have, and he is in constant touch with the members of the State Department who are directly charged with conducting our affairs with foreign nations. The judgment of these men, and of the President, should prevail, in the absence of clear proof to the contrary. In addition to the presumption in favor of his proposal, it seems to me that conditions and events which are common knowledge justify the action which we are asked to take.

The principal criticism of this proposal has been that our Government bypassed the United Nations. This criticism has, to a great extent, been allayed by the amendment offered by the distinguished and able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. VANDENBERG]. This amendment clearly negatives the charge of imperialism, as well as the charge that we would, by this unilateral action, scrap the United Nations. On the contrary, in giving the majority of the Security Council, or the General Assembly, the right to disapprove our actions, I think we would strengthen the United Nations. We would reaffirm our faith in the validity of the moral judgment of that body and reassert our determination to do what we can to foster its influence among the nations of the world.

Those critics who say that the whole matter of aid to Greece and Turkey should have been submitted for a decision to the United Nations in the first instance, are either naive or are opposed to any aid to Greece and Turkey. It is no secret that until a better understanding is reached between Russia and the western democracies, especially the United States, the United Nations Security Council cannot make decisions of primary importance involving controversial matters. Russia has already used the veto on 10 different occasions and, I have no doubt, would use it against aid to Greece if she were given the oppor-

tunity to do so. In view of Russia's attitude, I think it would have been an idle gesture to submit the basic decision to the United Nations, even though we had been willing to supply the money and personnel, which the United Nations does not have.

I do not think the proposed action on our part is an admission that the United Nations is a failure. The impotency of that Organization in this instance is a contingency which many people anticipated in the beginning. It is simply one of the difficulties, and there will be others, which must be overcome in the long and tedious process of creating an effective organization to keep the peace.

In the debate on the adoption of the United Nations Charter in July 1945, I pointed out that I believed there was a misconception about the significance of the Organization. Some advocates of the Organization naturally exaggerated its powers and its virtues while others dismissed it as an idle dream. Some concluded that having created and joined the United Nations our troubles were over and that peace was assured. Nothing could be further from the truth.

Peace can never be assured by a beautiful charter or a solemn treaty with a big red seal. The achievement of peace is a continuing, day-to-day process requiring wisdom and patience of the highest order. The adoption of the United Nations Charter was but the first tentative step toward the creation of rules of conduct for all nations. Primarily, it gives us the machinery for bringing together the various nations for the discussion of the problems of the world. As the Senator from Michigan has said, it is "A town meeting of the world." However, until the various nations are willing to subject themselves to definite rules of law, positive action involving the power relationships of the great powers is difficult if not impossible. The United Nations can foster better understanding among the nations through education, the exchange of persons, economic agreements, and the free exchange of information; but until the big powers trust one another more than they do now, it cannot preserve the integrity of Greece or Turkey, or any other country.

Until such time as we are able to make the United Nations strong enough and trusted enough to deal with sovereign powers effectively, it is to our interest, and to the interest of all free and independent peoples, to prevent any single nation from being able to dictate to, or dominate, the world. The Communist party has developed a technique of aggression different from any heretofore developed, or perhaps it is more accurate to say that they have brought to a higher state of perfection than anyone else the technique of infiltration and corruption from within. The Nazis used this technique with success in Austria, Norway, Belgium, and France; but they were novices compared to the Communists.

The danger to us that arises from communism is that there is good reason to believe that the present Russian Government directs and dominates the Communist parties and their policies throughout the world. It is the concentration of control in the Politburo in

Moscow that makes communism the real danger that it is. This control, coupled with the technique of infiltration and subterfuge, confronts us with the possibility of world domination without direct attack by force. Since it is an unorthodox and unfamiliar method of aggression, it has confused and divided the democratic peoples of the world and thereby weakened their power of resistance.

Mr. President, the principal reason the proposal of the President appeals to me is the fact that it is a program of positive and definite action to combat, in a vital area of the world, this gradual disintegration of independent peoples brought about by the infiltration of Communists. We have, I believe, in good faith tried to work with the Russians in reestablishing orderly governments, supported by the peoples concerned; but the Russians have not agreed. At long last, our President has now proposed that this country shall take steps to counteract the apparently unlimited expansion of communism. It is a positive program. It is open and aboveboard for all the world to see and, as now drawn, it is subject to the approval of a majority of the free peoples who constitute the United Nations.

The reason for our special concern for Greece and Turkey is that they are the key countries to the Middle East, to southern Asia, and to Africa. If these two countries should succumb to the influence of the Communists, the door would be open to Asia and Africa. If Africa, Asia, and Europe were subjected to the exclusive control we have come to know as the Iron Curtain, our future would indeed be dark. Shut off from the resources and markets of the greater part of the world, and confronted with an overwhelming power, we could not survive as an armed camp doing business only with ourselves.

In Europe, Asia, and Africa there are approximately 1,775,000,000, or 82 percent of the 2,150,000,000 inhabitants of the world. The remainder, 375,000,000, or 18 percent, live in the Western Hemisphere, the British Isles, and the Pacific islands. The proportion of inhabitants in Europe, Asia, and Africa is in excess of four to one and the natural resources are distributed accordingly. It appears to me that in view of these plain facts it is of the utmost importance that we preserve the independence of Greece and Turkey until such time as communism ceases to be aggressive, or the United Nations becomes an effective organization.

Mr. President, it is true that we have commercial interests in the resources of the Middle East as well as an interest in preventing the unlimited expansion of Russia. I, for one, am perfectly willing to negotiate with Russia for an equitable disposition of these resources, once we can be assured that she will not take over the political domination of the region. Furthermore, I think our proposal for the control of the Dardanelles is fair and just to all parties concerned, including the Russians.

But, with regard to our commercial interests, the British likewise have interests, and it seems to me that the action

of the present British Government in terminating so abruptly their aid to Greece and Turkey indicated a lack of consideration for this country. In view of our friendship and our material aid to the British, it seems to me their Government acted most inconsiderately in giving us only a few weeks to consider and decide upon our policy in the Near East. We will grant this assistance to Greece and Turkey to protect our own interests, of course, and not Britain's, although her interests are similar to ours, but that fact does not lessen my resentment at the abruptness of her decision to withdraw her support from Greece and Turkey.

Mr. President, although the proposal before us concerns directly only Greece and Turkey, it does, in fact, have a bearing upon our policy in Europe. If, while we are engaged in the Near East, western Europe is taken over by the Communists we shall be cut off from our base and our efforts will be unsuccessful. At Moscow the four big powers for weeks have been striving to find a solution to the problem of Germany. From what I read in the newspapers they have made no progress. Until the fate of Germany is settled it is impossible to go to work seriously on the reconstruction of Europe.

I submit that unless we are able to create a different, a more sensible economic and political order in Europe, there is no hope for a prosperous or a peaceful solution to her difficulties. It is my belief that if all we are able to do is to recreate the prewar crazyquilt of jealous sovereignties, neither Europe nor the Near East is a good risk. If we persist in preserving an irrational and obsolete economic and political system in Europe, we can be sure that, for a third time, its internal frictions will supply the spark for world conflagration. No one can guarantee that a federation will absolutely prevent all sparks, but at least there will be a chance that it may.

Mr. President, it was in order that Congress and the people of the United States should have an opportunity at least to consider and debate the merits of European federation that on March 21, the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] and I submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 10) providing that the "Congress favors the creation of a United States of Europe within the frame work of the United Nations." On the same day a similar resolution was submitted in the House of Representatives by Representative Boggs, of Louisiana.

This is not a new idea. For centuries the leading thinkers and statesmen of the world have, from time to time, urged the creation of a federated Europe as the best method of bringing peace and prosperity to that unhappy region, and as one of the essential conditions for a peaceful world.

We know that both World Wars grew out of the conflicts which are inherent in the fragmented sovereignties of Europe. We know that so long as this senseless conglomeration of separate and economic entities exist there is little hope for the peace and prosperity of the world. We also know that the most

propitious time to move forward is just after society has been disturbed by some great upheaval leaving it in an unstable and fluid state.

I have noted in the press that the response to this suggestion has been that it is a fine idea, but that this is no time to bring forward such a suggestion, nor is it the time when there is any hope for its adoption. I submit that exactly the opposite is true; that if it ever is to be accomplished it can be accomplished only during such a period as this, when there is great unrest and when the treaties solidifying new regimes within the ancient framework have not been entered into. In other words, I think the only opportunity to bring the peoples of Europe together is afforded now when the necessity is impelling and the peoples of Europe are asking for assistance, which I think they should receive. Only in such a time can we be in a position to influence them in the slightest degree. Europe is in that condition today, and the time is ripe for a change. I cannot imagine that there will ever be a more propitious time to act than now. It is our job to see that the change is forward to a system of freedom and self-government rather than backward to slavery and tyranny.

No one can tell at this time how this proposal will be received by European countries. The practical thing to do would be for their representatives to meet and draw up a tentative constitution for the consideration of their own people and the people of other countries, including our own. Only by formulating a specific proposal dealing with all the questions involved in a federal union can the ideas of the people crystallize and a reasonable judgment be arrived at.

If the Congress should adopt now Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, I think it would give impetus to the calling of such a constitutional convention.

I have noticed within the last day or two that there is to be a meeting held this spring of some members of the various parliaments in Europe, where this proposal would be discussed informally. It is not in the form of a constitutional convention, and I do not anticipate that that particular meeting will reach any decision as to a specific constitution.

It is, of course, certain that many people will dismiss the proposal as naive and utopian, but we should remember that all proposals that promise any significant improvement in human affairs have always been branded utopian. The United States of America was, in the beginning, branded utopian, and its failure predicted by those who, if they were here today, would look with derision upon this proposal.

For several centuries, under the Roman Empire, Europe was united. Later, Charles the Great in the ninth century united all of Europe from Spain to the Elbe River under a single power. Europe has always been a cultural entity and, in the great days of the Renaissance, national lines were not closely drawn. Culture was not French or German or Spanish; it was European. Since prehistoric days, the inhabitants of Europe have belonged to the same white race whose branches are to be found also

in northern Africa and western Asia. They possessed a common primitive civilization going back to the neolithic age and the philologists tell us that, with one exception, all their languages are derived from a common mother tongue. Their political organizations and customs developed along similar lines and throughout their history were distinguishable from the servility which characterized oriental despotism.

Western Europe, exclusive of Russia, consists of a well-integrated economy and a land mass of approximately 2,000,000 square miles with 300,000,000 inhabitants. Physically, racially, and culturally, there is no insuperable obstacle to a reasonable federation of these peoples.

There are very special reasons why the people of the United States should consider at this time the re-creation of the unity which, in ancient days, enabled the Europeans to live in relative peace and happiness. Already we have made or are committed to make enormous loans to the nations of Europe. We are spending hundreds of millions of dollars feeding the people of Germany and the devastated countries. We are faced in the immediate future with the further obligation of supporting Greece and Turkey at great cost. But overshadowing all these obligations is the supreme interest that we have in creating a peaceful world. The primary reason for these loans and grants is the creation of a stable and orderly world in which we may live in peace, and yet we should know that money alone will not achieve our objective.

This proposal for a United States of Europe is not an idealistic dream to bring relief to the suffering people of Europe. Americans can be, if they are of a mind to be, sound practical businessmen. As President Truman said recently, we have already invested \$341,000,000,000 in preventing tyranny from enveloping the world. In addition, we are committed to spending \$600,000,000 annually to support Germany, many billions of dollars of loans to other European nations, and in the immediate future we probably shall undertake the support of Greece and Turkey. As practical people we may well ask ourselves, How do we finally work out from under these obligations?

There is no simple, all-inclusive answer to this question, but one of the essential conditions to any solution is the reestablishment of industry and commerce within the framework of a stable political system. In the Near East and in Europe a prerequisite to the revival of trade and industry is a United States of Europe. Without a prosperous Europe to consume the produce of the Near East and other countries and without the production of Europe's industry, I can see little hope for a revival of commerce on a substantial scale.

In Moscow at present the representatives of the great powers are trying to find a solution to the problem of what to do with Germany. They are confronted with a dilemma. On the one hand all of Europe and the Near East is in need of the goods which Germany could produce. Without that production, the rehabilitation of those areas will be slow indeed. But, on the other hand, the great powers

fear that if the industrial capacity of Germany is turned loose to produce at a maximum, for a third time a militant Germany will emerge to attack the world.

Mr. Herbert Hoover in his recent report to the President effectively presented the case against the present policy in Germany. Under this so-called "level of industry" policy the industrial capacity of Germany is arbitrarily reduced. For example, with a capacity of 19,000,000 tons of steel she can produce 6,000,000 tons, and the production of basic chemicals such as nitrogen which can be used for fertilizer is reduced to 40 percent of prewar production. Although we in the United States are short of these same articles we are forced to send to Germany huge supplies at the cost of the American taxpayer. In addition, the other countries of Europe are desperately in need of these articles and are unable to purchase them anywhere.

This inability to get fertilizer for food production and steel for reconstruction of worn-out factories is prolonging the chaotic conditions in Europe which is, I believe, one of the principal causes for the spread of communism. In desperation the people bargain away their freedom for a promise of food and employment. They do not know that the promise is false, but they do know that their hunger and idleness are real.

In the Near East we see another facet of the same problem. If we undertake the support of Greece and Turkey, how and when can we stop the lavish outpouring of our resources? We are not likely to stop it until those countries are self-supporting economically, which, in turn, will give them political stability. Before the war Turkey sold one-half, and Greece one-third, of her exports to Germany. Without the restoration of that market, it is improbable that either country can prosper and thereby relieve us of our burden.

The way out of the dilemma in which we find ourselves is the creation of a United States of Europe. There are 14 States which are not yet dominated by the Communists. These states have a population of nearly 300,000,000 persons.

I may say that in the creation of such a federation I would not make it an exclusive federation. It should be what I would call an open federation, which would welcome the addition of nations some of which are now dominated by regimes which I believe to be communistic, and which are influenced by Russia, and which I think have possibilities of throwing off such domination. I believe that one of the greatest incentives for their throwing off such domination would be the creation of a federation with some stability which would give them an opportunity to go somewhere other than remain under the wing of the Communists. So while I mention only 14 countries as now being eligible—and by that I mean only that they have a free choice and would be able to make such a decision—I do not mean to leave the impression that this would be an exclusive federation which would not welcome additions in eastern Europe when and if those countries are able to

make a choice in accord with the will of their people.

If Germany should be reorganized as a federation of states, as she was before Bismarck, and those states then merged into a United States of Europe with 300,000,000 people, there would be little danger of a revival of German militarism and slight chance of her dominating the federation.

With the federalization of Europe would come freedom of commerce, the free movement of persons, a common currency, and efficient transportation. The result would be a rising standard of living and a lowering of the political rivalries and economic tensions which generate war.

If we grant that a United States of Europe is the answer to our dilemma, we may then ask ourselves, What are the prospects for its creation? It is to be expected that Russia will oppose it. Such a federation would not threaten Russia, but it would, with the return of decent living conditions, put an end to the spread of communism in Europe. Russia's opposition, exerted through her influence on the Communist parties, especially in France, is the greatest obstacle to the achievement of federation. But even in France the Communists control less than 30 percent of the votes, and therefore with strong leadership in the democratic parties of Europe she could take the lead in promoting the union. Although France is torn by internal dissension, I cannot believe that she is through as a great nation, or that she will not develop again statesmen of the caliber of Jaures or Briand, who advocated so eloquently the creation of a United States of Europe. If France should take the lead, and were supported by this country and England, I think a federation could be created in spite of the opposition of Russia.

Since the days of Teheran, Russia has worked overtime the theme of her fear of aggression and concern for her own security. But during the intervening years we have seen that by a combination of the Red Army and the infiltration of her secret police she has acquired the domination of many smaller nations with more than 60,000,000 of people. She has professed a faith in the United Nations, but her actions in and out of that organization belie that profession. Her expansion already is so great that she threatens the power to survive of all other independent nations except our own. If the United Nations is to have a chance to succeed as a voluntary union of peoples, it is imperative that, pending the realization of its objective, the existing power relationships among the great nations be preserved. This country cannot tolerate the expansion of Russia to the point where she controls, directly or indirectly, all the resources and manpower of Europe, Asia, and Africa. If that should come about, no longer would there be an opportunity for a voluntary association of nations. The issue would certainly be decided by war. In seeking to maintain the integrity of Europe by federation, we would not threaten Russia's security, but we would make a substantial contribution to the ultimate

success of the United Nations and, incidentally, assist Russia to develop the self-restraint which is so patently lacking in her present philosophy of government.

In any case, I think it has now become clear to us that Russia does not intend, if she can help it, to permit the rehabilitation of any European country, except under the aegis of the Communist Party. I do not think she will go to war in the near future to enforce this policy, but she is prepared to bring the full force of her economic and propaganda power to bear on the issue.

Unless we are willing to write off Europe as a friend and supporter of democratic principles, it behooves us to use our economic power and our talents of persuasion to induce Europeans to create a free and democratic federation of states. Under such a union, the world may again see a renaissance of culture, of freedom, and of spiritual power which once before led the world out of the confusion and tyranny of the Dark Ages.

Mr. President, for the convenience of those who may wish to know more about what others think of this proposal, I wish to read a few excerpts from articles and editorials written in recent months by some of the leading students of international affairs. I think it is particularly appropriate, in view of his identification with the development of our foreign policy during the past several months and in connection with the development of the bipartisan or nonpartisan foreign policy, to read a brief excerpt from a speech which has been the basis of much discussion. The speech was made by John Foster Dulles before the National Publishers Association dinner in New York, and is reported in the New York Herald-Tribune of January 18. Mr. Dulles stated:

Peace should not be made dependent upon artificial conditions which hold only so long as there is external coercion. That was the main trouble with the Treaty of Versailles. Its terms, if enforced, would have kept Germany impotent for a thousand years. But enforcement depended upon external coercion, which rapidly evaporated. Peace conditions, to be durable, should be self-enforcing. What is needed in respect of Germany is decentralization. At the beginning that can be imposed. A large measure of political autonomy can be given to German states. But that decentralization will not stick unless also there develop natural forces which turn the inhabitants of Germany's States toward their outer neighbors. The economic forces operating upon Germans should be centrifugal and not centripetal. Only if decentralization is enforced by such forces can it be depended upon.

When the German problem is thus analyzed it is apparent that it calls—

And this is the particular point which I have been endeavoring to make—

for some application of the Federal formula. Under our Federal system the citizens of Pennsylvania share with others legislative control over the interstate movement of their coal and their steel products. The port of New York is operated by an autonomous authority established by treaty between New Jersey and New York. The Tennessee Valley development is operated by a Federal authority, not by the State of Tennessee. We propose an international authority to own and operate atomic development everywhere so

that nowhere can it fall under national control, which might use it for war rather than for economic welfare.

Such precedents suggest that it is not beyond human resourcefulness to find a form of joint control which will make it possible to develop the industrial potential of western Germany in the interest of the economic life of western Europe, including Germany, and do so without making Germans the masters of Europe.

Whether a solution along this line is practical, and the scope to be given it, will depend primarily upon our continental allies themselves. The non-continental victors—Soviet Russia, Great Britain, and the United States—cannot impose any such solution. If, however, our Continental friends are thinking constructively—and there is evidence that many of them are—we Americans ought to be able to give them precious assistance. We possess, with Great Britain, decisive power in western Germany. We have, more than any other people, experience in using the Federal formula and in developing its manifold possibilities. If we employ these assets to solve the problem of Germany, we shall have made a good start in implementing our 1947 resolve.

I have also several articles, all of which I shall not read, but I should like to read a few sentences from them; and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks for the convenience of the Senate the articles which have been selected, all of which have a bearing upon this question.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the order is made. (See exhibit A.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. One article is from the Wall Street Journal of February 3, 1947, entitled "Europe's Last Chance," by William Henry Chamberlin. The subheading reads as follows:

Economic federation, including Germany, is essential first step; political ties could come later, creating a fourth great power.

I shall read one or two paragraphs from it which I think are especially pertinent:

There may well be a strong temptation in the United States to fall into a mood of embittered, disillusioned isolationism as disappointments and frustrations multiply in Europe. But we shall yield to this temptation at our peril. Our sense of insecurity would be greatly enhanced if western Europe should fall into a welter of social chaos or follow eastern Europe into the orbit of Soviet influence.

What we should do, in our own interest quite as much as in Europe's is to try to bring some pattern of hope and order out of the war's fearful legacy of misery and confusion. The most hopeful means to achieve this end is to subordinate the patchwork jobs of relief and rehabilitation which must be done in individual countries to a master plan for bringing into closer association those European countries which lie outside the sphere of Soviet control.

The European problem in general and the German problem in particular may remain insoluble if they are approached on the assumption that the continent must remain divided into completely independent sovereign States, each with its economy in a watertight compartment. The supreme dilemma of Germany is that there can be no healthy European recovery without a revival of German trade and industry, while France and the smaller European States fear a renewal of German aggression if Germany becomes too strong.

I also have an article by Mr. Sumner Welles which comments upon the same subject. I should like to read an excerpt from it. It was published on February 5, 1947, in the Washington Post:

One of the most heartening developments in Europe in recent months has been the rapid increase in the popular demand for the establishment of a European federation.

No one who talked with the European statesmen attending the recent meeting of the Cleveland Council on World Affairs could have failed to be impressed with the sense of urgency in the opinions they expressed. They were frank in saying that only a federated Europe could survive. And these convictions were by no means voiced solely by the representatives of western Europe.

Two weeks ago it was announced in London that a Provisional British Committee for a United Europe has been established under the chairmanship of Winston Churchill. This committee is an outgrowth of Mr. Churchill's speech at Zurich last year. But it is significant that the committee is far from being an organ of the Conservative Party. Prominent members of the Labor Party and of the Liberal Party are serving on it.

Some of the chief proponents of a Federated Europe are of course obsessed with the belief that such a federation must be used as a barrier to Soviet expansion and be employed as a leverage to force Moscow to come to terms in the negotiation of the German Treaty. The violent diatribes recently emanating from Moscow against the doctrine of European federation and against its leading advocates are due in part to this fact. They are due far more, however, to the Russian recollection of the efforts of the Allied powers in 1919 to create a cordon sanitaire around the Soviet Union, and to the Russian belief that any European federation now initiated would be destined merely to serve the same ends.

The stark truth is, however, as Prime Minister Attlee said a few months ago, "Europe must federate or perish." One of the great problems which now confront the statesmen of the United Nations is how this objective can be secured in the face of Russian opposition.

I also have an article by Miss Dorothy Thompson published in the Washington Star, and I wish to read briefly from it:

Fifteen distinguished Europeans, or Americans of European background, most of them scholars, from 10 European countries, have addressed a declaration and appeal to the President and Congress, asking support for the establishment of an all-European confederation at the end of the war and setting forth 8 points in support and description of such a program.

The idea is not new. It has been advocated for years by the pan-European movement, headed by Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi. It has had the support in Britain of eminent publicists, such as Sir Walter Layton. It is believed that Mr. Churchill supports it, and edged toward it in his famous Guild Hall speech, calling for a council of Europe, and a council of Asia, to be established after the war.

As the great power world emerges, the problem of postwar Europe becomes more and more urgent. Will Europe fall into social and political anarchy? Are all the petty and anachronistic sovereignties to be restored? Has not this war demonstrated the essential weakness of all the European states? And has it not also proved that this weakness is a temptation to direct aggression, and to indirect interventionisms, spheres of influence, and all the other power games which led to this dreadful struggle? Is Europe, as a civilization and culture, fin-

ished? Is it to be further Balkanized or will there again, in some future, be an attempt to write it under another domination, by force or the threat of force?

These leading questions have so far not received a statesmanlike answer. In fact, reading the various declarations, from Teheran, for instance, or from Yalta, one receives the impression that Europe, that great complex of 350,000,000 people, is henceforth of negligible importance.

Yet the answer to these questions lies in the heart of the German problem. This column has contended—with perhaps boring repetitiveness—that there is no solution to the German problem until the European problem, of which it is a part, is solved. If the European problem is solved, the German problem can be. And only if the European problem is solved can the world count on peace.

Included in the matters I desire inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks is an article by Walter Lippmann on the same problem, appearing in the January 21 issue of the Washington Post.

Mr. President, I have a considerable amount of other material giving the background of this situation and, I think, furnishing much food for thought. I shall not place it in the RECORD at this time. I intend at a later date to present further editorials and background material showing the universal approval of this proposal, but also I confess, showing a feeling of frustration and a feeling that we are unable to present and to carry through a positive program in Europe at this time. It is the same old feeling that we are unable to take the dilemma by its horns and do something positive, instead of following the program of piecemeal relief which we have followed in the past.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 3, 1947]

EUROPE'S LAST CHANCE—ECONOMIC FEDERATION, INCLUDING GERMANY, IS ESSENTIAL FIRST STEP—POLITICAL TIES COULD COME LATER, CREATING A FOURTH GREAT POWER

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The preliminary auguries for the conclusion of the German and Austrian peace treaties which are an essential part of European reconstruction are not hopeful. There is the same weary bickering over procedure which dragged out to such inordinate length the discussions of the peace settlements with the minor states which aligned themselves with Germany. Fantastic reparation demands are advanced at a time when Germany is in such a state of economic prostration that its people must be spoonfed from the United States and Great Britain. Small countries which seem to have learned little from historical experience propose to snip off bits of German territory here and there, creating new festering sores of nationalist discontent.

There may well be a strong temptation in the United States to fall into a mood of embittered, disillusioned isolationism as disappointments and frustrations multiply in Europe. But we shall yield to this temptation at our peril. Our sense of insecurity would be greatly enhanced if Western Europe should fall into a welter of social chaos or follow Eastern Europe into the orbit of Soviet influence.

What we should do in our own interest quite as much as in Europe's, is to try to bring some pattern of hope and order out of the war's fearful legacy of misery and confusion. The most hopeful means to achieve

this end is to subordinate the patchwork jobs of relief and rehabilitation which must be done in individual countries to a master plan for bringing into closer association those European countries which lie outside the sphere of Soviet control.

A SINGLE ECONOMIC UNIT

Some fresh, thoughtful, and constructive ideas pointing in this direction are to be found in the recent speech of Mr. John Foster Dulles before the National Publishers Association. Mr. Dulles suggested that the war victors should "think more in terms of the economic unity of Europe and less in terms of the Potsdam dictum that Germany shall be 'a single economic unit.'" Mr. Dulles added that there should be economic unification of Germany, but that there should also be, and for the same reasons, economic unification of Europe. And he offered a fresh and hopeful approach to the complex German problem when he suggested:

"It is not beyond human resourcefulness to find a form of joint control which will make it possible to develop the industrial potential of western Germany in the interest of the economic life of western Europe, including Germany; and do so without making Germans the masters of Europe."

The European problem in general and the German problem in particular may well remain insoluble if they are approached on the assumption that the Continent must remain divided into completely independent sovereign states, each with its economy in a watertight compartment. The supreme dilemma of Germany is that there can be no healthy European recovery without a revival of German trade and industry; while France and the smaller European states fear a renewal of German aggression if Germany becomes too strong.

This dilemma might appear less formidable if the vast German industrial potential of the Ruhr and the Rhineland could be linked with the industries of France, Belgium, and Luxemburg and operated under some form of international control, in which all the interested countries would have a voice. There are other projects of hydroelectric power and transportation development which could be worked out best under some method of economic internationalism. The worst of Europe's crisis will be over when there is general agreement to place the emphasis on reconstruction, not revenge, on raising living standards all around, not on artificially depressing living standards in Central Europe.

WOULD CONSTITUTE A FOURTH GREAT POWER

It is probably only through some form of political federation (although this may be expected to develop more slowly than projects for economic cooperation) that Europe can hope to make good in some measure the fearful weakening and impoverishment of the war. A federated Europe would possess sufficient population and resources to constitute a fourth great power, comparable with the United States, the Soviet Union, and the British Commonwealth. Failing some scheme of federation it is only too probable that the weak, divided European nations will find themselves being used as pawns by the Big Three. A federated Europe would be a buffer between the western powers and the Soviet Union, would be strong enough to resist attempts of domination, and would consequently be an excellent guaranty of peace.

Amid all the desolation and hates of Europe there is a consciousness of common cultural and economic ties among thoughtful Europeans of many nationalities. The Pope has often spoken in accents of genuine concern for the whole fabric of European civilization, not of partisanship for or against any single nation. Winston Churchill has placed his influence behind a movement to promote European unity and European leaders of varying schools of thought have endorsed the idea.

What is now needed is a strong push from the country that is able to do most, politically and economically, for the realization of the ideal of a federated Europe. That country is the United States. If federation is Europe's last chance, the realization or non-realization of this ideal may well mark the difference between success and failure in America's foreign policy, which aims, or ought to aim, at the promotion of a free, stable, and prosperous Europe.

[From the Washington Star]

ON THE RECORD

(By Dorothy Thompson)

Fifteen distinguished Europeans, or Americans of European background, most of them scholars, from 10 European countries, have addressed a declaration and appeal to the President and Congress, asking support for the establishment of an all-European confederation at the end of the war, and setting forth eight points in support and description of such a program.

The idea is not new. It has been advocated for years by the Pan-European movement headed by Richard Goudenrove-Kalergi. It has had the support in Britain of eminent publicists, such as Sir Walter Layton. It is believed that Mr. Churchill supports it, and edged toward it in his famous Guild Hall speech, calling for a council of Europe, and a council of Asia, to be established after the war.

As the great power world emerges, the problem of postwar Europe becomes more and more urgent. Will Europe fall into social and political anarchy? Are all the petty and anachronistic sovereignties to be restored? Has not this war demonstrated the essential weakness of all the European states? And has it not also proved that this weakness is a temptation to direct aggression, and to indirect interventionisms, spheres of influence, and all the other power games which led to this dreadful struggle? Is Europe, as a civilization and culture finished? Is it to be further Balkanized, or will there again in some future be an attempt to write it under another domination, by force or the threat of force?

These leading questions have so far not received a statesmanlike answer. In fact, reading the various declarations from Teheran, for instance, or from Yalta, one receives the impression that Europe, that great complex of 350,000,000 people, is henceforth of negligible importance.

Yet the answer to these questions lies in the heart of the German problem. This column has contended—with perhaps boring repetitiveness—that there is no solution to the German problem until the European problem, of which it is a part, is solved. If the European problem is solved, the German problem can be. And only if the European problem is solved can the world count on peace. The authors of the Declaration of European Interdependence know it. They advance the same thesis as that of Albert Guerard, in his new book published by the Stanford University Press, "Europe, Free and United." I hope it gets the attention, in high places, that it deserves.

The thesis of the declaration is:

1. That the nations of Europe constitute, by reasons of geography and history, an interdependent region of the world.
2. That nothing short of confederation can secure for Europe lasting peace, speedy recovery, and personal liberty.
3. That a confederation authority should create a confederation armed force to protect all European peoples against aggression and tyranny.
4. That no fourth Reich should ever be established, but when Hitlerism and Pan-German imperialism have been overcome the various states of the Reich should enter the confederation.

5. That the confederation should protect all Europeans against racial, social, and religious discrimination and guarantee civil liberties and cultural autonomies.

6. That a social bill of rights should aim at assuring all Europeans freedom from want.

7. That the confederation should gradually liquidate all inter-European trade barriers and transform Europe into a single market with a common currency and a coordinated transportation system.

8. That within these limits of continental solidarity the European confederation should respect the various democratic constitutions of its member states and guarantee their security and equality.

Sooner or later Europe must emerge free and united or Europe will be, as the authors of this declaration state, an all but certain source of another war, as well as a breeding ground for tyranny, putches, and adventurisms of all sorts. Never in modern history has Europe been so fragmented, especially economically, as it has been since the last war. In England, especially, there is growing dismay lest a broken Europe slowly drag down with it the whole of western civilization.

Above all, the United States, out of her own wonderful experience of the Union of the States, should support a European confederation plan. Victory must be translated into new life, and that means a modern political, social, and economic system.

[From the Washington Post of February 5, 1947]

A UNITED EUROPE—NEED FOR EFFECTIVE FEDERATION

(By Sumner Welles)

One of the most heartening developments in Europe in recent months has been the rapid increase in the popular demand for the establishment of a European federation.

No one who talked with the European statesmen attending the recent meeting of the Cleveland Council on World Affairs could have failed to be impressed with the sense of urgency in the opinions they expressed. They were frank in saying that only a federated Europe could survive. And these convictions were by no means voiced solely by representatives of western Europe.

Two weeks ago it was announced in London that a Provisional British Committee for a United Europe has been established under the chairmanship of Winston Churchill. This committee is an outgrowth of Mr. Churchill's speech at Zurich last year. But it is significant that the committee is far from being an organ of the Conservative Party. Prominent members of the Labor Party and of the Liberal Party are serving on it.

A movement known as European Action was simultaneously inaugurated in Paris under the presidency of Professor Brugmans, an outstanding leader of the Dutch resistance and a guiding force in the Dutch Labor Party. In explaining the objectives of European Action, Professor Brugmans said: "Europe is not destined to be a western bloc set up in opposition to other blocs, but an international system composed of independent nations which freely unite. We reject the theory that we are compelled to select between the United States of America or the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. We select Europe and a European federation because we are confident that Europe can become a factor in bringing about international agreement. The Netherlands, for instance, is at the crossroads of German, Anglo-Saxon, and Latin civilizations. If it is true to say that the Netherlands is one of those countries that has a clear mission in Europe, it is equally true to say that all of Europe has a similar mission in the world."

Some of the chief proponents of a federated Europe are, of course, obsessed with the belief that such a federation must be used as a barrier to Soviet expansion and be employed as a leverage to force Moscow to come to terms in the negotiation of the German treaty. The violent diatribes recently emanating from Moscow against the doctrine of European federation and against its leading advocates are due in part to this fact. They are due far more, however, to the Russian recollection of the efforts of the Allied Powers in 1919 to create a cordon sanitaire around the Soviet Union, and to the Russian belief that any European federation now initiated would be destined merely to serve the same ends.

The stark truth is, however, as Prime Minister Attlee said a few months ago, "Europe must federate or perish." One of the great problems which now confront the statesmen of the United Nations is how this objective can be secured in the face of Russian opposition.

There are two indispensable prerequisites to a United Europe.

Under existing world conditions, no successful European federation can be created, save as a temporary military measure, unless the Soviet Union plays a cooperative part in its establishment and operation.

The second requisite is that the provisions of the forthcoming German treaty make a European federation possible.

John Foster Dulles made a statement which is profoundly true when he said in his address of January 17: "The German settlement will not of itself bring about a federation of Europe. . . . But the German settlement may decisively determine whether the movement will be toward economic unification or toward rebuilding the whole structure of independent, unconnected sovereignties."

If the German treaty compels the political decentralization of Germany and requires a degree of autonomy on the part of the several German states sufficient to permit of a close integration of their economies with the economies of their non-German neighbors, Europe can eventually obtain economic unification. Without such a foundation there can be no political federation of Europe.

It is, of course, alleged that the active participation of the Soviet Union in a European federation would merely facilitate the consolidation of Russian influence over central and western Europe.

While this analogy, like most analogies, is far from perfect it should be remembered that the major reason for the original opposition of some of the governments of Latin America to the creation of the existing inter-American system was their fear that the preponderant power of this country, especially because of its previous high-handed policies, would make it far easier for the United States rapidly to control all of the rest of the New World, were a regional system to be established.

Europe desperately needs some effective form of political and economic federation. But it cannot be obtained unless the German treaty facilitates it. And it cannot be advanced until the present suspicions of the Soviet Union can be dispelled, and unless the Soviet Government can be convinced that its own enlightened interest will be best served by the construction of a European system founded upon political and economic federation rather than upon that anarchic conglomeration of clashing sovereignties to which so many of the ills which the peoples of Europe have suffered during the past thousand years can be directly ascribed.

[From the Washington Post of January 21, 1947]

MR. DULLES ON EUROPE

(By Walter Lippmann)

The address made last Friday to the National Publishers Association by Mr. John

Foster Dulles marks a turning point of great significance in the development of United States foreign policy. His close association with Governor Dewey and with Senator VANDERBERG, as well as the timing of the address, makes it certain that he was speaking for the leading elements of the Republican Party.

As a result of the elections in November the Republicans are no longer merely the opposition, and their role in foreign policy is greatly changed. Once "bipartisan cooperation" meant that they would not obstruct and oppose. Since San Francisco it has meant that they would collaborate and support. Now, as Mr. Dulles' address shows, they have a program to propose and they will attempt to lead.

The crux of the proposal is that we should work not for another German settlement as such but for a new European settlement. The first question, of course, is whether Mr. Dulles is in conflict with the policy of the administration. The truth here is, I think, that his German and European program is entirely consistent with the best hopes and intentions of the State Department and of General Clay's conduct of military government. But for various reasons, which we need not dwell upon again, these hopes and intentions have never yet been set forth coherently and systematically as the American policy for Europe.

Mr. Dulles has now done that. He has made explicit what has been implicit. He has stated positively and constructively what has thus far been obscured and confused by an excessive preoccupation with details, with temporary difficulties of the occupation, with small expedients, and with the quest for tactical advantages in the general diplomatic conflict with the Soviet Union. There ought, however, to be no serious obstacle to a fundamental agreement. For the way Mr. Dulles asks the administration to take is the way every important person in it, who has thought much about Germany, really wishes to go.

The next question is how much support such an American policy can have among the bigger and the smaller nations who must make the settlement. Probably we must assume that the Soviet Government will begin by not liking it. But it does not follow that in the end the Soviet Government may not be induced to accept it.

The inducements are very great, and they may even be compelling. For this is not, as the Russians themselves and many others may at first think, a plan to organize a western bloc against the Soviet Union. The plan calls for a radically decentralized confederation of German states connected by political and economic ties with the surrounding countries of Europe. That would be a western bloc only if the Russians themselves made it one. It would become a western bloc only if they prevent the German states in their zone from joining the confederation, and if they compel Poland and Czechoslovakia to stay out of a European system.

The practical virtue of this approach is that a great part of Europe can be reconstructed even if the Soviet Union does not at first agree. The fact that so much of Europe can be organized without Soviet participation should act as a most compelling inducement to the Soviets to participate in this organization of the whole of Europe.

This is not, then, a tough policy in the sense that it is designed to organize a coalition to isolate Russia. But it is a tough-minded policy in that it denies to the Russians the right or the power to veto the reconstruction of that great part of Europe which they do not in fact control. The benefits of participation will remain open to the Russians and to the Germans in their zone, and to the countries in their orbit. But if they do not choose to come in, the western world could still do a great deal for itself without them.

These inducements may take some time to work. A great deal of diplomatic effort will

be necessary to meet the inevitable suspicions of Moscow, and to overcome the hesitations and reluctance and the nervous lethargy which are an aftermath of the war.

Many European governments, though they agree in principle, may encounter the opposition of their own Communist Parties. But this opposition is not necessarily irreconcilable. Much will depend, of course, upon the position finally taken by the Moscow government itself. But there will be other factors. The Communist leaders in all countries may take their directions from Moscow. But their constituents are not all of them by any means thick and thin followers.

This program of a European settlement conforms to very powerful currents of thought and feeling throughout Europe. It is in the first instance an alternative to the nightmare of almost all Europeans—that their continent is to be treated as the stakes of Soviet-American diplomacy, and is destined to become the battlefield of another world war. For this is a proposal to recreate the community and the independence of Europe, not to subordinate Europe to the conflict of the great non-European powers.

Moreover, within the framework of this proposal, the vital interests of France and of the other neighbor states in respect to Germany can be satisfied. Once the proposal becomes concrete and real through negotiation, it would not be so easy for Communist Parties to oppose it. For their support in countries like France depends on their upholding the national interest. There is no reason to believe they could keep the following they have acquired since the war if, obeying orders from Moscow, they took a position openly and flagrantly opposed to the historic interests of their own country.

As long as American and British policy appeared to be merely anti-Soviet, as long as they had no constructive European program, the native Communists could follow Moscow without being in clear conflict with the national interest. But if, as Mr. Dulles proposes, we aim at a settlement for Europe, and not at a coalition against Russia, we have a good prospect of winning wide support in all parties throughout the continent of Europe.

THE CALENDAR

MR. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills and other measures on the legislative calendar to which there is no objection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maine? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first measure on the calendar.

SUSPENSION OF ENFORCEMENT OF CERTAIN OBLIGATIONS AFFECTING GOLD AND SILVER MINES

The bill (S. 27) to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war was announced as first in order.

MR. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Maine if he does not think that a quorum should be present at this time. I am sure that he does, and therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Buck	Capehart
Ball	Butler	Capper
Brooks	Cain	Chavez

Gonnally	Johnston, S. C.	Pepper
Cooper	Kem	Reed
Cordon	Kilgore	Revercomb
Donnell	Knowland	Robertson, Wyo.
Downey	Langer	Saltonstall
Dworshak	Lodge	Smith
Eastland	McCarran	Sparkman
Eaton	McClellan	Taft
Ellender	McFarland	Taylor
Fulbright	McGrath	Thye
George	McKellar	Tobey
Green	McMahon	Tydings
Gurney	Malone	Vandenberg
Hayden	Martin	Watkins
Hickenlooper	Millikin	Wherry
Hill	Moore	White
Holland	Morse	Wiley
Ives	Murray	Williams
Jenner	O'Connor	Wilson
Johnson, Colo.	O'Mahoney	Young

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] is necessarily absent on official business.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY and Mr. UMSTEAD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is detained on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Under the agreement for the call of the calendar, Calendar No. 5, Senate bill 27, has been reached. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 27) to provide for suspending the enforcement of certain obligations against the operators of gold and silver mines who are forced to cease operations because of the war was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GREEN subsequently said: Mr. President, I did not hear Senate bill 27, Calendar No. 5, called. I was prepared to ask that it go over. It is the first measure on the calendar that was called.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That bill was passed.

Mr. GREEN. It did not go over?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; it was passed.

Mr. GREEN. Then I move that the Senate reconsider the votes by which the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Rhode Island desire to have the bill returned to the calendar?

Mr. GREEN. Yes; I wish it to stay on the calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Rhode Island that the votes by which Senate bill 27, Calendar No. 5, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and passed, be reconsidered, and that the bill be returned to the calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 597) to protect American agriculture, horticulture, livestock, by prohibiting the importation of garbage derived from products originating outside of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 110) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to certain agreements between carriers was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 865) to provide for the striking of medals in lieu of coins for commemorative purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 2102) to provide for a 6 months' extension and final liquidation of the farm labor supply program and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT NATIONAL PARK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 731) to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Park; to erect a monument in memory of the Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments, on page 4, in line 6, after the word "National", to insert "Memorial"; on page 5, in line 2, after the word "National", to insert "Memorial"; and in line 22, after the word "National", to insert "Memorial."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to establish the Theodore Roosevelt National Memorial Park; to erect a monument in memory of Theodore Roosevelt in the village of Medora, N. Dak.; and for other purposes."

Mr. CORDON subsequently said: Mr. President, during the call of the calendar a short time ago House bill 731, Calendar No. 51, was passed. There is an error in the description of the property with which the bill is concerned, which property is to be made into a national memorial park. Therefore, at this time I ask unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the votes by which the amendments to House bill 731 were ordered to be engrossed and by which the bill was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? Without objection, the votes by which the amendments were ordered engrossed and the bill read a third time and passed are reconsidered.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I now offer the following amendment in line 23, on page 5: Strike out the figure "5" and insert in lieu thereof the figure "6."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILLS PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 45) to change the name of Boulder Dam to Hoover Dam was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill S. 669, to provide for the payment of a bonus of 30 cents per bushel on wheat and corn produced and sold between January 1, 1945, and April 18, 1946, was announced as next in order.

Mr. BALL. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 350) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1949, was announced as next in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PURCHASE OF SURPLUS PROPERTY BY RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The bill (H. R. 2535) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROMOTION OF SUBSTITUTE EMPLOYEES IN THE POSTAL SERVICE

The bill (H. R. 1713) to provide for the promotion of substitute employees in the postal service, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANDREW CHIARODO

The bill (S. 241) for the relief of Andrew Chiarodo was considered, ordered

to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Andrew Chiarodo is hereby relieved of any liability to the United States for the repayment of sums amounting in the aggregate to \$597.50 heretofore paid to him as a plasterer at the United States naval air station, Anacostia, District of Columbia, for the period from February 26, 1945, to March 17, 1946, inclusive. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States the said Andrew Chiarodo shall be considered to have been in the employ of the said air station at the rate of \$1.39 per hour during such period and legally entitled to said compensation for such period, and no officer or employee, or former officer or employee, of the United States shall be liable to the United States for the amount paid to the said Andrew Chiarodo as compensation for such period.

LILLIAN M. LORRAINE

The bill (S. 243) for the relief of Lillian M. Lorraine was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the indebtedness to the United States of Lillian M. Lorraine, and the said Lillian M. Lorraine is hereby relieved of any liability to the United States for the repayment of sums amounting in the aggregate to \$1,794 heretofore paid to her as a stenographer and clerk in the office of the paymaster, United States Marine Corps, Philadelphia, Pa., for the period from January 1, 1931, to April 6, 1946, inclusive. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States, the said Lillian M. Lorraine shall be considered to have been employed in said office at the rate of \$2,160 per annum from January 1, 1931 to June 30, 1945, inclusive, and at the rate of \$2,496 per annum from July 1, 1945, to April 6, 1946, inclusive, during such period and legally entitled to said compensation for such period, and no officer or employee, or former officer or employee, of the United States shall be liable to the United States for the amount paid to the said Lillian M. Lorraine as compensation for such period.

GLENN A. J. HOWREY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 254) for the relief of the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 6, before the name "Colorado" to strike out "Denver", and insert "Pueblo"; on line 6, after the words "sum of"; to strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$500"; on page 1, line 12, before the name "Colorado", to strike out "Denver" and insert "Pueblo", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Glenna J. Howrey, a minor, of Pueblo, Colo., the sum of \$500 in full satisfaction of the claim of the said Glenna J. Howrey against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her as a result of an accident which occurred when she was struck by a United States mail truck at the intersection of East Fourth and Erie Streets in Pueblo, Colo., on December 27, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding.

Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COL. FRANK R. LOYD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 425) for the relief of Col. Frank R. Loyd, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the word "property," to strike out "; and (2) the sum of \$800, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of amounts expended by him in evading capture by Japanese military forces," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Col. Frank R. Loyd, of Laramie, Wyo., (1) the sum of \$604.49, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the difference between (a) the amount he was actually allowed as compensation for the value of the personal property which he lost as a result of the invasion of the Philippine Islands by the Japanese, and (b) the amount which the War Department has now determined should have been allowed to the said Col. Frank R. Loyd as compensation for the value of such property: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with these claims, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 2413) to amend the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

HEATING OF PROPERTY OF DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

The bill (S. 516) to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Federal Works Administrator, through the Public Buildings Administration, be, and is hereby, authorized to furnish steam from the central heating plant for the use of the Daughters of the American Revolution on the property designated as square 173 in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That the Daughters of the American Revolution agree to pay for the steam furnished at reasonable rates, not less than cost, as may be determined by the Administrator of the Federal Works Agency: *Provided further*, That the Federal Works Administrator, through the Public Buildings Administration, is authorized to prepare plans and specifications and to supervise and

contract for the work necessary to connect with the Government mains and to receive payment from the Daughters of the American Revolution by the transfer of funds in advance to cover the cost of such work and services, including administrative expenses: *And provided further*, That there shall be no liability on the part of the Government on account of any damages that may accrue hereunder.

ARMY AND NAVY NURSE CORPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1943) to establish a permanent Nurse Corps of the Army and the Navy and to establish a Women's Medical Corps in the Army.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on the Armed Services, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], who had to go to the Army Day parade to represent the Armed Forces Committee, I shall, at his request, attempt to answer any questions concerning the establishment of the proposed Nurse Corps.

The principal reason for the establishment of the Nurse Corps in the Army and Navy is a very simple one. It is impossible to get nurses unless provision is made for a permanent Nurse Corps. Unless that is done, very shortly the nurses will go back to their old status, with a pay level of approximately \$1,085, whereas the pay of nurses today is substantially in excess of that amount.

The bill has been agreed to by both the Army and the Navy. It is drawn exactly on the same basis for the Army and the Navy, and in the opinion of the leading officers of both services it will enable them to obtain the services of nurses. It will not enable them to get the nurses perhaps as easily as they would like. The pay level which will be established, with the possibilities of retirement, will make employment in the services somewhat preferable to service in private hospitals and public hospitals today, but with the disadvantages incident to the nurses having to move where the Army and the Navy may call for them, the higher pay level seems fair.

The bill is reported unanimously by the committee, and I believe the committee in the House reported it unanimously and it was passed by the House. In my opinion the bill is a proper one and is essential in order to obtain nurses for Army and Navy hospitals.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. What advantages are given to the nurses under the bill which are not now afforded them?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. They will become officers in the armed forces. If the Senator will get a copy of the report of the committee, he will find a summary of all the principal features set forth on page 2 of the report.

Mr. ELLENDER. How much more will it cost the Government?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I was present at the hearings, and my recollection is that it will not cost the Army and the Navy any more than they are now paying for

nurses. It will cost them more than the prewar level. They cannot get nurses at the prewar level.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RETIREMENT PRIVILEGES FOR FBI PERSONNEL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 715) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That section 1 (b) of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) Any special agent, special agent in charge, inspector, Assistant Director, assistant to the Director, Associate Director, or the Director, who is at least 50 years of age and who has rendered 20 years of service or more as a special agent, or as aforesaid above, in the Federal Bureau of Investigation may, on his own application and with the consent of the Attorney General, retire from the service and such annuity of such employee shall be equal to 2 percent of his average basic salary for the 5 years next preceding the date of his retirement, multiplied by the number of years of service, not exceeding 30 years."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, this is the so-called FBI bill. Up to the present time those who work for the FBI have not had the retirement privilege. Under the bill anyone who has worked for the FBI for 20 years and has reached the age of 50 may receive a retirement pension based on 2 percent of his average basic salary for the 5 preceding years multiplied by the number of years of service up to 30. I might add that all civil-service employees, except those dealing with narcotics, now have the retirement privilege.

Mr. President, this is a bill suggested by the Attorney General; it has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, and it was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Civil Service.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 526) to promote the progress of science; to advance the natural health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HILL. Over.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 81) authorizing the Committee on Civil Service to investigate the appointment of first-, second-, or third-class postmaster was announced as next in order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Over.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

The bill (S. 564) to provide for the performance of the duties of the office of

President, in case of the removal, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HAYDEN. Over.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

UNITED STATES SENATE ADDITIONAL OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (S. 723) to authorize the preparation of preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional office building for the use of the United States Senate, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Architect of the Capitol, subject to the direction and supervision of the Senate Office Building Commission created by the Sundry Civil Appropriation Act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 481), the membership of which is hereby increased from three to five members, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, is authorized and directed to prepare preliminary plans and estimates of cost for an additional office building for the use of the United States Senate.

SEC. 2. The Architect of the Capitol is authorized to make such expenditures as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for such purpose the sum of \$25,000.

RENEWAL OF INSURANCE POLICIES

The bill (H. R. 1327) to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expired 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAN RIVER DAM, N. C.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 64) granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a dam across the Dan River in North Carolina, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments, on page 1, line 5, before the word "dam", to insert the word "low"; on line 8, after the name "Virginia", to insert "for the purpose of providing a pool for condenser water for a steam electric plant"; on page 2, line 15, after the word "energy", to insert "And provided further, That the grantee, or its successors, shall hold and save the United States free from all claims arising from damage which may be sustained by the dam herein authorized, or damage sustained by the appurtenances of the said dam, by reason of the future construction and operation by the United States of Philpott reservoir or of the proposed dam across Dan River at Schoolfield, Va., as proposed in House Document No. 650, Seventy-eighth Congress, and approved for construction in Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, or other Federal project: And provided further, That the grantee shall, at the direction of the district engineer, Corps of Engineers, and without cost to the United States, reconstruct or relocate the existing streamgaging facility owned by the United States Geological Survey and situated on the Dan River in the vicinity of Leaksville, N. C."; and on page 3, line 12, after the words "amend or", to strike out the word "appeal" and to insert the

word "repeal", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc. That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to Duke Power Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a low dam across Dan River at a point in Rockingham County, N. C., near Leaksville, and about 91 miles above the mouth of said river at Clarksville, Va., for the purpose of providing a pool for condenser water for a steam electric plant: *Provided*, That work shall not be commenced until the plans therefor have been submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, and by the Secretary of War, and when such plans have been approved by the Chief of Engineers and by the Secretary of War, it shall not be lawful to deviate from such plans either before or after completion of said dam unless the modification of such plans has previously been submitted to and approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War: *Provided further*, That in approving the plans for said dam such conditions and stipulations may be imposed as the Chief of Engineers and Secretary of War may deem necessary to protect the present and future interest of the United States: *And provided further*, That this act shall not be construed to authorize the use of such dam to develop water power or generate hydroelectric energy: *And provided further*, That the grantee, or its successors, shall hold and save the United States free from all claims arising from damage which may be sustained by the dam herein authorized, or damage sustained by the appurtenances of the said dam, by reason of the future construction and operation by the United States of Philpott Reservoir or of the proposed dam across Dan River at Schoolfield, Va., as proposed in House Document No. 650, Seventy-eighth Congress, and approved for construction in Public Law 534, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, or other Federal project: *And provided further*, That the grantee shall, at the direction of the district engineer, Corps of Engineers, and without cost to the United States, reconstruct or relocate the existing stream-gaging facility owned by the United States Geological Survey and situated on the Dan River in the vicinity of Leaksville, N. C.

SEC. 2. The authority granted by this act shall cease and be deemed null and void unless the actual construction of the dam hereby authorized is commenced within 3 years and completed within 5 years from the date of approval of this act.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUPPORT FOR WOOL—CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Over.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that at the conclusion of the consideration of the calendar I shall move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Senate bill 814.

The **PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Objection being heard, the bill will be passed over.

BILL AND RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1017) providing for temporary continuation of rent control,

transferring rent control to the Housing Expediter, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TAFT. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

The resolution (S. Res. 25) amending rule XXII relating to cloture was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be passed over.

WORLD JAMBOREE OF BOY SCOUTS

The bill (H. R. 1621) to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment and provide services to the Boy Scouts of America in connection with the World Jamboree of Boy Scouts to be held in France, 1947; and to authorize the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to provide exemption from the transportation tax; and further to authorize the Secretary of State to issue passports to bona fide Scouts and Scouters without fee for the application or the issuance of said passports, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

PARTICIPATION IN THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1005) to amend the act of June 28, 1935, entitled "An act to authorize participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union," which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments, on page 1, line 5, before the word "annually", to strike out "\$27,000" and insert "\$30,000", and on line 6, after the word "authorized", to strike out "\$12,000" and insert "\$15,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of June 28, 1935 (49 Stat. 425; 22 U. S. C. 276), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"An appropriation of \$30,000 annually is hereby authorized \$15,000 of which shall be for the annual contribution of the United States toward the maintenance of the Bureau of the Interparliamentary Union for the promotion of international arbitration; and \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to assist in meeting the expenses of the American group of the Interparliamentary Union for each fiscal year for which an appropriation is made, such appropriation to be disbursed on vouchers to be approved by the President and the executive secretary of the American group."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. In the absence of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Chair might be permitted to say that the bill authorizes an appropriation of \$30,000 for participation by the United States in the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. TAFT. May I ask the Chair if that is the only change made by the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is the only change.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. That completes the calendar.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that at the earliest opportunity I shall ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 81, which is No. 78 on the calendar.

SUPPORT FOR WOOL—CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 83, Senate bill 814 to provide support for wool, continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is the motion to take up the bill debatable?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then, sir, I hope that the bill will not be considered by the Senate at this time. I say that because the hearings on this important bill have not as yet been printed, and are not available to Members of the Senate except in typewritten form. The bill should be very carefully considered by the Senate. Furthermore, I understand that there is to be an executive session again tomorrow on the Lilienthal nomination, and that thereafter the Senate will consider and debate the highly important question of the Greek-Turkish loan.

Senate bill 814 is a departure from our whole agricultural program of support in that it puts wool on a comparable price basis rather than a parity price basis. It also involves the expenditure of a very substantial amount of money annually by the Federal Government.

I know that my good friend and colleague from Wyoming will say that unless the bill is considered and acted on at this time, unless some kind of legislation concerning wool is passed, the Secretary of Agriculture will withdraw the whole program as of April 15. I say to that argument that the Commodity Credit Corporation under the present law will continue until June 30, and that there is no reason why the Secretary of Agriculture, if he desires to continue to support the program, and if he has an intimation that Congress will take some action on this subject, cannot continue the program beyond April 15. I repeat, I hope the Senate will not take up this bill at this time, because I believe it should be very thoroughly discussed.

If the bill is taken up at this time, I say most respectfully that my colleague from Massachusetts and I, who are vitally interested in the wool trade in Massachusetts, will want to go into the bill in very considerable detail. I hope,

sir, that the bill may come up directly after the disposition of the Greek-Turkish loan proposal, if the leaders in charge of the legislative program approve of that course. We shall have no objection to taking it up in a week or 10 days, when the hearings are printed, and when there will be more ample time to discuss the bill than there can possibly be this afternoon.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I join with my colleague in expressing the hope that the Senate will not proceed to the consideration of this bill until the hearings have been printed and until every Member of the Senate has had an opportunity to familiarize himself with the argument. I shall not enter upon the argument today. I think Members who know me will agree that I try to take a broad view of such questions, and that I have not the slightest desire in the world to antagonize legislation which is beneficial to any of the important interests of the United States; but looking back over the 7 years of my service in the Senate, I say it is most unusual to proceed with the consideration of a bill so complex as this bill is, involving as it does the philosophy of the relationship of the Government to agriculture, without waiting until the hearings have been printed so that Members of the Senate who are not on the committee and who do not happen to have any personal contact with the problem may have an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the issues which confront us. We want to cast an informed vote. Every Senator wants to know what he is doing. I am not asking any of my colleagues to vote one way or the other, but I think every Senator has a right to ask time so that his vote may be an informed vote based upon the facts and upon the evidence which has been no painstakingly developed by the Committee on Agriculture.

For that reason, Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will not proceed to the consideration of this bill at this time. I have no desire at all to delay action; I shall be glad to have it come up as soon as the hearings are printed; but until that time I hope the motion will not be agreed to.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE WOOL STUDY PRINTED

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I rise to support the motion of my colleague to proceed to the consideration of the bill S. 814. This proposed legislation dealing with the wool industry has been before Congress and the public for many years. A special committee of the Senate gave consideration to this matter over a period of some 5 years. Volumes were printed and have been circulated all over the country. Last year the Committee on Agriculture of the House, after full hearings, gave approval to legislation of this character.

The Special Committee on Wool last year recommended legislation of this character, and that report—printed, by the way—went to the Senate Committee on Agriculture, as did the hearing also. Then the Committee on Agriculture also held hearings, which were printed and circulated, and which are now available, dealing with every question that is in

this bill. There is no reason to withhold action now because of any lack of public information or for lack of printed hearings. The volumes of the hearing of the Committee on Agriculture of the Senate last year are readily available to every Senator who desires to obtain a copy; and I may say that those hearings contain a full and complete exposition of the views of the Boston wool trade, which is opposed to this legislation.

So, Mr. President, we have this situation: The Senate Committee on Agriculture last year and again this year, by an overwhelming vote, has given its approval to legislation of this character; the House Committee on Agriculture last year likewise took similar action, and this year the House Committee on Agriculture, after a hearing, reported favorably a bill to deal with the very acute problem of the wool growers of the United States. That bill is now before the Rules Committee of the House. So we can say to the Senate that the Committee on Agriculture in each body has twice considered this bill and twice recommended favorable action. I said "this bill." I should not have said that because the bill is not precisely the same one that was introduced and recommended at the last session, but it is very similar. There has been full opportunity for those who are opposed to the legislation to express their point of view, and the only opposition that has been expressed throughout the consideration of this measure comes from the small group representing the Boston wool trade, which stands between the producers of wool in the United States and the manufacturers of woolen garments. The hearings are available to every Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, I feel that there is no reason why the Senate should not now vote favorably on the motion of my colleague and take up the bill for consideration. I hope the Senate will support the motion. If that action is not taken the domestic wool industry will be denied the legislative action it needs. The measure of stabilization proposed last year has been materially reduced by the action taken this year, but to decline now to take the bill up would be to disregard the needs of the growers altogether.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement regarding the urgency of the immediate passage of the Senate bill. The Secretary of Agriculture has stated that he will no longer support wool prices after April 15 unless authorization is made by Congress. April 15 is about the time when the Southern States, especially Texas, begin to market their wool. If the proposed legislation is not passed now and no future supports are provided, the wool growers will find themselves in this situation: Unquestionably the market will drop drastically as of April 15, and the wool growers of the Southern States will then take a much lower price and within a month or two from now, if this legislation is subsequently enacted, then those producers who market their wool later will receive a higher price.

This proposed legislation has been pending for a long while. The Commit-

tee on Agriculture and Forestry has held extensive hearings, and I can see no reason why the Senate should not proceed now to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I should like to add a few words to what my distinguished colleague and the Senator from North Dakota have said. April 15 is the dead line for the purchase by the Commodity Credit Corporation of the domestic clip. By that time approximately 8,000,000 pounds of grease wool will have been purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation. That includes the wool produced in the State of the Senator from North Dakota, as the Senator said, the eight-month Texas wool, most of the Arizona wool, most of the Hagerman Valley, Idaho, wool, and some of the Ohio fleece wool. The first wool to be shorn in the 1947 year, as I have said, has already probably been purchased.

All the bill does is to ask the extension of the Commodity Credit Corporation purchasing program for a period of 2 years. Today the wool-producing industry is not in a position to start out on a new program. It is still more or less on a war basis. For instance, while the average increase in wages in industry throughout the United States has been between 60 and 65 percent, in the wool-producing industry today the wage increase is still 200 percent.

The cost of feeds for the sheep has greatly increased. Hay, for instance, which before the war could be bought at from \$5 to \$6 a ton, today costs from \$15 to \$20 a ton.

The industry needs the protection it received during the war years. The object of the bill is to provide that protection.

I might say that so far as the CCC is concerned there will be very little money needed, if any, to take care of this bill. I earnestly ask the Senate to proceed immediately to the consideration of this most urgently needed legislation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I notice that the report of the Department of Agriculture suggests that it is unwise to include the provision about a comparable price; they feel that the price should not be higher than that at which the Commodity Credit Corporation supported wool in 1946 which, I understand, was on an average between 41 to 42 cents. The Department of Agriculture apparently recommends 44.1 cents, which they say the bill would cover. In view of the fact that the bill apparently contemplates some loss in the sale of wool at a lower price than that at which it was bought, I wonder whether it is necessary to insist upon the higher price now contained in the bill as an alternative.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I may say in answer to the Senator from Ohio that I should be glad to accept an amendment during the consideration of the bill to fix the same price for the 1947-48 clips as was paid for the 1946 clip, which was between 41 and 42 cents in the grease per pound. That is what is being paid today for the early

shorn wool of 1947. I should be very glad to accept an amendment to that effect to the bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I hope the motion of the Senator from Wyoming will prevail. The Senators from North Dakota have been receiving telegrams and letters urging the enactment of the legislation. As my distinguished colleague has so ably said, we have a feeling in my State that unless something is done soon the farmers will suffer a tremendous loss. I have received a letter from the head of the wool pool of North Dakota and letters from various county agents and county associations recalling to us that they have directed our attention time and again to the date, April 15. We might as well dispose of the legislation now as at a future time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 814.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming if he would state again the amendment to the bill which he is willing to accept.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I said I would accept an amendment to limit the price to be paid for the 1947 and 1948 clips and to make it the same as the price paid by the Commodity Credit Corporation for the 1946 clip.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I may say that such an amendment would make the bill more acceptable, but at the proper time I shall offer as a substitute for Senate bill 814, Senate bill 917, which is a bill introduced by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] and myself, which would fix a somewhat different price than that suggested by the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for an inquiry?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator from Massachusetts doubtless heard the remarks of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] a few moments ago on the question whether it is essential in order that the Senate may have adequate information on this subject to have before it the printed copies of the hearings recently concluded. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts whether in his opinion the information given by the data to which the senior Senator from Wyoming referred is in itself sufficient to inform the Senate upon the subject matter, or whether in the judgment of the Senator from Massachusetts the additional hearings recently concluded are essential in order that we might have a reasonably good picture of the entire situation?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say in answer to the Senator from Missouri that I believe, though I cannot state authoritatively and definitely, that questions were discussed at this year's hearings which were not brought out at last year's hearings. I refer particularly to the comparable-price question. I have read a great deal from the reports of last year. I believe they constitute a full discussion, but I do not believe that they treat some of the questions which were

raised by Senate bill 814 this year. However, I do not wish to say that definitely.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in response to the inquiry of the Senator from Missouri I am glad to be able to assure him that the subject mentioned by the Senator from Massachusetts was fully discussed at last year's hearings. There is full information available to all Senators. I have already undertaken to obtain copies of the hearings. They are on their way to the Chamber and will be available to all Senators who desire to obtain them.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The price ranges are certainly different this year than they were last year. That includes the parity prices and the prices of wool.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Prices of various commodities are changing. As a matter of fact, prices are going up at a very alarming rate, as everyone who follows our economic condition knows. But that has nothing to do with the principles involved in the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is quit correct. The principles involved in the bill were discussed last year; but there is still the question of price and the question of cost to the Government under the new bill. Under the terms of the suggested amendment, if it were accepted by the Senator from Wyoming, the cost to the Government would be greater during the coming year.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I suggest to the Senator that that is a matter for debate when we are considering the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 814.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have listened to the argument of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] with a great deal of interest, and with the admiration which I always have for his eloquence and ingenuity. I believe that the speech which he made here in 1937 in connection with the bill to increase the membership of the Supreme Court was without doubt one of the ablest speeches I have ever heard in my life. It is no wonder to me that the Senator from Wyoming has had such a successful career, and that his many relatives and friends in Massachusetts follow his activities with so much admiration. But when he tries to establish the point that we can get along this year with last year's hearings, I think even he, with his eloquence and ingenuity, strains our imagination just a little.

There was an election last November. There are a few of us here who were not here last year. Some of us appeared before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. There are a few of us here who were not here last year, and who are now members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and who tried to make a contribution to this problem by asking a few questions to throw light on it.

Even if the bills were identical—which they are not—even if the price figures were exactly the same—which they are

not, and even if there were not a great many other differences—which there are—it would still be untenable for a Senator utterly to disregard the contribution which the new Members of this body have tried to make to this question, and to seek to create the impression in the minds of Senators that last year's hearings are perfectly adequate. If that were true, Mr. President, why did we have any hearings this year? Why did the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], chairman of the committee, and all the other members of the committee, sit by the hour taking testimony?

No, Mr. President, today we are not settling any question about wool. Today we are settling the question of whether the United States Senate is going to keep faith with its own procedure, whether the Members of this body are going to seek to cast an informed vote, and whether we are to be willing to wait for a few days—a week at the most—until the hearings are printed, and until those who are vitally concerned with this question have an opportunity to prepare their case.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to tell the Senator from Massachusetts that the stenographic reports have not even been ordered to be printed. At least 3 weeks will be required to have them printed.

Mr. LODGE. I have not looked into that question, but I should be very much surprised if the hearings could not be printed more quickly than that. I have on my desk a copy of hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations. They were printed in short order. I believe that if the Senator from North Dakota and I were to join forces in urging the Government Printing Office to print these hearings quickly, it certainly could be done.

Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate longer. I merely express the hope that we shall seek to cast an informed vote on this question and wait until the evidence is before us.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 814.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LODGE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Ellender	McClellan
Ball	Fulbright	McFarland
Brooks	George	McGrath
Buck	Hayden	McKellar
Butler	Hickenlooper	McMahon
Cain	Hill	Malone
Capehart	Holland	Martin
Capper	Ives	Millikin
Chavez	Jenner	Murray
Connally	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Cooper	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Cordon	Kem	Pepper
Donnell	Kilgore	Reed
Downey	Knowland	Revercomb
Dworschak	Langer	Robertson, Wyo.
Eastland	Lodge	Saltonstall
Eaton	McCarran	Smith

Taft
Taylor
Thye
Tobey

Vandenberg
Watkins
Wherry
White

Wiley
Williams
Wilson
Young

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 814.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, if I may do so I should like to ask the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] whether or not there were any hearings held on Senate bill 2033 introduced during the second session of the Seventy-ninth Congress?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My recollection is that that was the number of the bill which I introduced. If my recollection is correct in that respect, the committee held long hearings upon it. Senate bill 2033 is the bill which was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry after it had been recommended by the Special Committee on Wool.

Mr. DONNELL. I should like to ask the Senator a further question. My question has a bearing, I think, upon the question as to whether or not the information obtained prior to the hearings recently concluded is sufficient for the Senate. I observe in report No. 85, filed on April 2, 1947, with respect to the pending measure, Senate bill 814, a letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER]. The letter is dated April 2, 1947. I call the attention of the Senator from Wyoming to this language in that letter:

The provisions of S. 814 are similar in some respects to the provisions of S. 2033, introduced during the last session of the Seventy-ninth Congress and approved by your committee with certain changes. While the main provisions of S. 2033 were endorsed by this Department in 1946, a number of developments have taken place since the close of the Seventy-ninth Congress which have caused us to make certain changes in our recommendations.

I call the Senator's attention to this further language in the letter of April 2, 1947:

In S. 2033, as originally introduced in the Seventy-ninth Congress, there was a provision which would authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out the price-support programs either by loans, purchases, support payments, or other operations. The provision authorizing that the program might be carried out by support payments was deleted from the bill reported out by your committee and has been omitted from the present bill, S. 814.

I call the Senator's attention to further language in the letter of April 2, 1947, as follows:

In S. 2033, Seventy-ninth Congress, and S. 103, Eightieth Congress, there also have been included provisions authorizing the establishment of official wool and mohair standards. These provisions are not included in S. 814, but we feel that it would be desirable for them to be included.

Mr. President, the question I desire to ask the senior Senator from Wyoming is this: In view of those various expressions by the Acting Secretary of Agriculture as to the differences between Senate bill 814, the measure now before us, and Senate bill 2033, which was before the last session of the 79th Congress, does the Senator from Wyoming still feel that the information before the Senate, without the printed report of the hearings recently concluded, is sufficient to advise the Senate adequately with respect to Senate bill 814.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my response without qualification is yes. I believe the information is absolutely sufficient. I say to the Senator that with respect to the quotations which he has read from the letter of the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, the explanation is that Senate bill 2033, as recommended by the wool committee a year ago, and as favorably reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a year ago, was much more extensive in its favorable dealing with the domestic wool growers than is the bill now before the Senate—not because the present Committee on Agriculture and Forestry or the sponsor of the bill, my colleague, desire any less protection for the domestic wool growers, but because we are speeding toward the final date when, if the Congress does not act, the domestic wool industry will face destruction.

For example, let us consider the recommended change with respect to the comparable price. I say to the Senator that practically all basic commodities have the benefit of the so-called comparable price formula. When the parity price was fixed for wool, wool was in a depressed condition. Therefore, we have asked for the comparable price because we have felt that domestic wool should have the same consideration as that given to other commodities which have the benefit of the comparable price.

With respect to the provisions of Senate bill 2033, the bill which I introduced last year, which dealt, for example, with the establishment of standards, I still believe that those standards should be fixed in the interest of the domestic industry; but we realized that with this final date bearing down upon us, it would be dangerous to take them into consideration. President Truman has indicated his willingness to act. He had directed the executive department and agencies to cooperate with me and the committee a year ago. He will sign this bill, I am confident. I regret that the committee has felt obligated to cut out some of the provisions—but half a loaf is better than no bread.

So the sponsors of this bill and the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry have been willing to sacrifice some of the provisions to which the Boston wool trade raised objections last year.

A few moments ago my colleague, in response to an inquiry of the Senator from Ohio, said he would be willing to accept an amendment by which the comparable price itself would be surrendered. I am sorry if we have come to that position; but if it is necessary to take that step in order to secure the enactment of such legislation by the 15th of April,

when the Commodity Credit Corporation will cease to support the wool industry, of course we must make whatever concessions are necessary.

But I hope the Senator will not ask the supporters of this bill to sacrifice the bill itself. Let us proceed to the consideration of the bill; and I assure the Senator again that the material available in the printed hearings covers every disputed and controversial issue in this measure.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a further question. Let me say first that during the course of this colloquy there has been handed to me a booklet containing hearings before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on Senate bill 2033 and Senate bill 1874, my attention having been directed to them by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. Those hearings were held on June 18, 19, 20, and 21, 1946.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Those are the hearings for which I called just a few moments ago. Those hearings show that Senate bill 2033, concerning which the Senator first interrogated me, was the one I introduced, and was favorably reported last year by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. DONNELL. I should also like to state that during the early portion of the colloquy on this matter this afternoon, there was handed to me by the distinguished junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] a copy of the hearings before the Special Committee to Investigate the Production, Transportation, and Marketing of Wool. That was a Senate special committee, established pursuant to Senate Resolution 150, and it held hearings in the latter part of November and on December 6, 1945.

I now wish to ask the Senator about the following sentence which I previously read from the letter of the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Brannan, under date of April 2, 1947, as set forth in Report No. 85, now before the Senate:

The provisions of S. 814 are similar in some respects to the provisions of S. 2033, introduced during the last session of the Seventy-ninth Congress and approved by your committee with certain changes.

I ask the Senator whether he thinks that is a correct recital of the facts.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is substantially correct.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I have listened to this debate with interest, of course. The only question is whether the bill shall be considered.

This matter has been pending before the Congress for a considerable period of time. As was pointed out by the Senator from Missouri, it was before the last Congress, and at that time there were elaborate hearings.

I very much hope the Senate will not refuse to take up the bill and give it a hearing. It is of the highest importance to the wool industry. The time is short. It seems to me that the bill is at least deserving of consideration by the Senate. Therefore, I hope the Senate will adopt the motion.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to say, in reply to the Senator from

Texas, that there is no objection on the part of the Senators from Massachusetts, I am confident, to having this matter fully discussed as soon as the hearings are printed, and I hope that will be the case after the Greek-Turkish loan is taken up and disposed of.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. In the meantime the 15th of April probably will have arrived, and disaster will follow.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I point out again to the distinguished Senator from Texas that the present wool program can be continued until the 30th of June. There is nothing to prevent that except the suggestion of the Secretary of Agriculture that it not be continued. It can be continued at his discretion or if the Members of Congress ask him to do so.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the Senator from Wyoming: Have transcripts of the hearings been prepared?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Stenographic transcripts have been prepared.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 814. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BUSHFIELD] is absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BALDWIN], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MOORE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] is necessarily absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are detained on official business.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senators from North Carolina [Mr. HOEY and Mr. UMSTEAD], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr.

SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 10, as follows:

YEAS—53

Aiken	Fulbright	Millikin
Ball	George	Murray
Brooks	Hayden	O'Connor
Buck	Hickenlooper	O'Mahoney
Butler	Hill	Pepper
Cain	Holland	Reed
Capehart	Jenner	Revercomb
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Robertson, Wyo.
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Taft
Connally	Kilgore	Watkins
Cooper	Knowland	Thye
Cordon	Langer	Vandenberg
Donnell	McCarran	Wilson
Downey	McClellan	Wherry
Dworschak	McFarland	Wiley
Eastland	McGrath	Taylor
Eaton	McKellar	Young
Ellender	Malone	

NAYS—10

Ives	Martin	White
Kem	Saltonstall	Williams
Lodge	Smith	
McMahon	Tobey	

NOT VOTING—32

Baldwin	Hatch	Overton
Barkley	Hawkes	Robertson, Va.
Brewster	Hoe	Russell
Bricker	Lucas	Sparkman
Bridges	McCarthy	Stewart
Bushfield	Magnuson	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Maybank	Thomas, Utah
Ferguson	Moore	Tydings
Flanders	Morse	Umstead
Green	Myers	Wagner
Gurney	O'Daniel	

So the motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first amendment of the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The first amendment of the committee is on page 2, line 9, before the word "may", to insert the word "and."

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on February 21, last, the President of the United States in a special message recommended that the Congress authorize and appropriate "not to exceed \$350,000,000 to assist in completing the great task of bringing relief from the ravages of war to the people of the liberated countries." A bill—House Joint Resolution 153—to carry out that recommendation, has been introduced and is now pending in the Congress. That measure, no doubt, will soon be here in this body for our consideration and action.

On March 12 the President, in an address to a joint session, further recommended that the Congress provide authorization "for assistance to Greece and Turkey in the amount of \$400,000,000

for the period ending June 30, 1948." Bills are now pending to carry out this recommendation of the President—H. R. 2616 and S. 938. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, to whom S. 938 was referred, has unanimously reported this measure favorably, with an amendment. The bill is now on the calendar, and I understand it is the intention of the majority that it be taken up as soon as the pending business shall have been finished.

Another bill—Senate Joint Resolution 77—providing for membership and participation by the United States in the International Refugee Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor in the amount of \$75,000,000 was passed by the Senate on March 25 and is now pending in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, these three pending proposals if enacted into law will further obligate our Government for relief expenditures abroad in the amount of \$825,000,000. I do not at the moment undertake to express my opposition to all or either of these measures, but, Mr. President, I am concerned about them and deeply regret the necessity for their enactment, if, in fact, such necessity exists.

The Chief Executive, in his address to the Congress on March 12, reminded us that we contributed \$341,000,000,000 toward winning World War II as an investment in world freedom and world peace. Of this war cost, our Government still owes some \$260,000,000,000, the amount of our national debt, and assuming that we shall henceforth be able to effectuate reasonable economy in our fiscal affairs, it is a conservative estimate that we will have an annual Federal expenditure for many years to come of around \$30,000,000,000. That means, Mr. President, a tax burden indefinitely on the American people in excess of \$30,000,000,000 annually if we are to meet in full current expenditures and if we are to make any substantial progress toward retirement of the national debt.

Taking these indisputable facts into account and remembering our efforts and experience following World War I when we invested some \$14,000,000,000 in loans and grants to foreign governments for world relief and reconstruction, I became curious to know, Mr. President, just how much our Government has already expended and has become obligated to spend for relief and assistance to foreign countries and peoples since VJ-day. During the past several days I have made diligent inquiry of the several appropriate departments of Government and with the aid of the General Research Section of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, I have obtained some very pertinent information which I believe the Members of Congress should have and weigh in the course of our consideration of these pending measures and any further legislation that may come before the Congress proposing any additional expenditures and obligations on the part of our Government for world relief and rehabilitation.

I believe this information will also be of considerable interest to the people of this Nation whose earnings and taxes we are spending when we appropriate moneys from the Federal Treasury in support of these various proposals and relief programs. In order to present the facts as clearly and in as much detail as possible, I have had prepared and shall ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks some 21 different tables of figures with notations thereon that give a pretty clear picture with respect to the assistance that our Government has given foreign countries and peoples since July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946, together with anticipated expenditures for these purposes, including commitments already made through June 30, 1947.

The first table that I desire to have incorporated in the RECORD is one showing the total amount that our Government has expended from July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946. The total is \$12,066,215,311. This table shows by what departments or through what departments these expenditures were made, and the amount thereof. The table also shows that since January 1, 1947, we have contributed to or invested in or paid into the Export-Import Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development the sum of \$3,215,037,500.

Further commitments and anticipated expenditures from all sources through June 30, 1947, add another \$1,506,838,500. The table shows the grand total of the expenditures that we have already made during the first 18 months following VJ-day and shall have made by the end of the present fiscal year, or within 2 years following the end of hostilities, in the amount of \$16,788,091,311.

I ask unanimous consent that this table be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—Recapitulation of all aid such as loans, property credits, advances, relief expenditures, lend-lease, and commitments to the International Fund and Bank provided by the United States Government to all foreign countries for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946

Department of State.....	\$59,147
War Department.....	840,847,431
Navy Department.....	23,741,783
UNRRA.....	1,875,007,434
Lend-lease fiscal operations..	1,438,970,972
Office of Foreign Liquidation Commissioner.....	1,005,458,616
Maritime Commission.....	107,197,511
Department of Agriculture..	392,655,186
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	25,000,000
U. S. Commercial Company..	7,458,532
Office of Metals Reserve.....	19,926,745
Office of Rubber Reserve.....	6,406,904
Export-Import Bank.....	2,250,710,000
International Monetary Fund.....	5,275,000
International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.....	317,500,000

Treasury Department.....	\$3,750,000,000
Total.....	12,066,215,311
Payments since Jan. 1, 1947:	
Export-Import Bank.....	152,812,500
International Monetary Fund.....	2,744,725,000
International Bank.....	317,500,000
Total.....	3,215,037,500
Further commitments and anticipated expenditures from all sources through June 30, 1947.....	1,506,838,500
Total.....	4,721,876,000
Grand total.....	16,788,091,311

Mr. McCLELLAN. The next table I submit and ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, is a table showing the anticipated expenditures from January 1, 1947, through June 30, 1947, but which does not include the anticipated expenditures which will be made if the pending legislation, the three bills to which I have referred, should be enacted.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 2.—*Tentative estimate of aid to be rendered to foreign countries for period Jan. 1 through June 30, 1947 (not including the 3 pending bills)*

Department of State.....	None
War Department relief.....	\$457,851,000
Navy Department relief.....	None
UNRRA.....	600,000,000
Lend-lease fiscal operations (estimate).....	25,000,000
Office of Foreign Liquidation Commissioner (estimate).....	75,000,000
Maritime Commission (estimate).....	115,000,000
Department of Agriculture, 80 percent of \$186,000,000 sugar crop.....	150,000,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.....	None
U. S. Commercial Company.....	None
Office of Metals Reserve.....	None
Office of Rubber Reserve.....	None
Export-Import Bank.....	235,800,000
International Monetary Fund.....	2,745,725,000
International Bank.....	317,500,000
Treasury Department.....	None
Total.....	4,721,876,000

The War Department relief funds represent the amount the War Department still has available for overseas relief until June 30, 1947.

UNRRA funds are on hand and uncommitted.

The estimated \$25,000,000 of lend-lease is involved in a settlement with the Netherlands.

Of the \$75,000,000 estimated item for the Office of Foreign Liquidation, \$60,000,000 have already been committed or credit extended, leaving only \$15,000,000 to be committed within the next 3 months.

The Agriculture Department item is money advanced primarily to Cuba on its sugar crop. These credits will be extended from June 1 for about a period of 6 weeks.

From January 1947 until March 15, 1947, Export-Import extended credits for \$155,800,000. March 15, 1947, to June 30, 1947, another eighty million will probably be extended.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, since one of these measures applied directly to Greece and we proposed to authorize and expend \$400,000,000 for the

relief of Greece and Turkey, I have thought it would be interesting to check up and find out exactly how much relief Greece has had during the past few years. I find that during the period from July 1, 1940, through December 31, 1946, the United Kingdom provided aid to Greece in the amount of \$632,380,000, and that our Government during the same period provided aid to Greece in the amount of \$407,481,063, making a grand total of \$1,039,861,063 in aid that has been provided to Greece by the United Kingdom and by our own country during that period.

I ask unanimous consent that table 3, which I submit, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 3.—*Total financial aid rendered to Greece by the United States and the United Kingdom for period July 1, 1940, through Dec. 31, 1946*

UNITED KINGDOM	
Waiver of 1940-41 loan.....	\$184,000,000
Maintenance of British troops in Greece.....	192,000,000
Expenses of British Economic Mission.....	380,000
Aid to Greek Army.....	120,000,000
Mutual aid.....	136,000,000
Total.....	632,380,000

UNITED STATES	
Department of Agriculture (food, fats, and tobacco).....	\$515,750
United States portion of UNRRA.....	245,422,054
American Red Cross.....	1,420,567
Lend-lease—direct from United States.....	81,562,813
Lend-lease — retransferred from United Kingdom.....	5,000,000
United States military disbursements (cash).....	1,407,653
United States nonmilitary disbursements (cash).....	5,675,075
Export-Import Bank loan of \$25,000,000 — utilized.....	3,400,000
War Department relief.....	3,379,658
U. S. Department of State contributions.....	958,039
Veterans' Administration.....	759,501
War Shipping Administration.....	304,138
Maritime Commission.....	109,353
Other agencies, such as Treasury, Post Office, etc.....	172,039
Property credits.....	59,394,423
Total.....	407,481,063
Grand total.....	1,039,861,063

UNITED STATES FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS WITH GREECE FROM JULY 1, 1940, TO DECEMBER 31, 1946

The United States has received from Greece from July 1, 1940, to December 31, 1946, \$3,000,000 in cash receipts or equivalent, as follows: \$2,000,000 in cash receipts; \$1,000,000 for drachma to cover United States operating expenses in Greece.

The United States held assets in Greece as of December 31, 1946, as follows: \$3,400,000 in loans outstanding; \$9,300,000 in property credits; \$4,500,000 in surplus-property inventories; \$2,200,000 in installations; total assets, \$19,400,000.

Of the \$407,481,063 provided Greece by the United States \$333,900,000¹ was in the form

¹In addition the United States furnished the Balkans \$30,000,000 in civilian supplies, but further distribution to countries, including Greece, is not known.

of relief, rehabilitation, civilian supplies, and lend-lease.

UNRRA: The United States contributed \$245,422,054 to Greece. Other nations contributed \$83,600,000. Total contribution was \$329,000,000.

Lend-lease: The United States furnished lend-lease amounting to \$86,600,000 to Greece, \$5,000,000 of which was a retransfer from Great Britain. Of the \$81,600,000 provided direct, \$75,700,000 was prior to VJ-day and \$5,900,000 after VJ-day. As of December 31, 1946, Greece had repaid \$105,195 of this.

Cash transactions: Were relatively small. Amounted to \$7,100,000 disbursements, \$2,000,000 receipts. Military disbursements were \$100,400,000; nonmilitary, \$500,700,000, which included \$300,400,000 loans. Receipts were from sales, interest, etc.

Future commitments: Of a total of \$59,400,000 in property credits, and \$25,000,000 in Export-Import Bank loans (totaling together \$84,400,000), property credits of \$9,400,000 and bank loans of \$3,400,000 have been made. This leaves total unexpended commitment of \$71,600,000.

United States installations in Greece: The United States had six installations in Greece, costing \$2,374,885. The Foreign Liquidation Commission of the State Department is completing liquidation of them.

World War I debt: Greece's total World War I indebtedness amounts to \$37,500,000; unpaid principal, \$31,500,000; interest, \$6,000,000. Of the total \$20,200,000 is delinquent.

Source: Office for Foreign Transactions, Business Economics Division, Department of Commerce.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I gladly yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. During the same period it should be remembered that the United Kingdom received an enormous amount of relief from the United States; so a considerable amount of relief that the United Kingdom extended to Greece originally came from the United States also.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think it would not be far wrong to say that either directly or indirectly we contributed every dollar of it, in view of the \$30,000,000,000 of lend-lease which we supplied to Great Britain, which enabled her during that period of time to render this assistance to Greece. Therefore, I think we can say that either directly or indirectly we provided substantially all of it.

Mr. President, we have made some other commitments. In some instances they were for such purposes as will, I am sure, enable us to receive some return.

I submit table 4, which shows that the State Department has made loans and advances to Uruguay in the amount of \$59,147. I ask that the table may be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 4.—*U. S. Department of State—Loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the U. S. Department of State for Office of Inter-American Affairs for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946*

Uruguay (loans).....	\$30,163
Uruguay (advances).....	28,984
Total.....	59,147

Mr. McCLELLAN. I now present table No. 5 showing relief dispensed by the

United States War Department in foreign areas for the period July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946, showing the countries in which this aid was given in a total amount of \$840,847,431. I ask unanimous consent that the table may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 5.—U. S. War Department—Relief dispensed by U. S. War Department in foreign areas for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946

Austria	\$54,646,583
Germany	258,370,672
Italy	103,654,259
Japan	188,062,842
Chosen	21,959,889
Ryukyu Islands	1,110,992
Netherlands Indies	4,105,731
Philippines	28,245,232
Europe in British zone	124,872,227
Europe in United States zone	55,718,286
Europe in Balkans	718
Total	840,847,431

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, table 6 shows relief dispensed by the United States Navy Department in foreign areas for the same period, July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946, in the amount of \$23,741,783. I ask unanimous consent for the insertion of the table at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 6.—U. S. Navy Department—Relief dispensed by U. S. Navy Department in foreign areas for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946

Caroline Islands	\$1,059,228
Marianas Islands	3,874,281
Marshall Islands	206,795
Ryukyu Islands	15,319,760
Ryukyu Islands, War and Navy	3,268,801
Miscellaneous Japanese Islands	12,918
Total	23,741,783

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the next table is quite interesting to me. It shows our contribution to UNRRA. The table, No. 7, shows the amount of our contribution expended by UNRRA from July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946, in the total amount of \$1,875,007,484. We knew we were spending that money, Mr. President, but the significant thing, and I think something of importance as we weigh these pending relief measures, and particularly two of them, is how much of America's money contributions to UNRRA went to certain governments and countries for their relief. I find, Mr. President, that out of the total of \$1,875,000,000-plus which we invested in UNRRA up to December 31, 1946, Russia, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia, and other countries which are definitely, I think we will agree, under Russian economic and political domination, received \$851,647,512, or 45 percent of our contribution to UNRRA for that period of time. I ask unanimous consent that the table may be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

TABLE 7.—UNRRA—Portion of relief and rehabilitation supplies furnished by the United States to UNRRA for distribution in various countries for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946

Albania	\$15,774,928
Austria	34,716,234
Belgium	898,017
United Kingdom (wheat diversion)	8,368,988
China	184,156,805
Czechoslovakia	150,362,106
Egypt	424,755
Ethiopia	44,923
Finland	1,175,337
France	2,997,352
France: Algeria	89,724
France: French Indochina	457
Germany	3,772,828
Greece	243,180,331
Hungary	1,291,985
Italy	265,401,792
Italy: Eastern Mediterranean islands	1,347,709
Japan: Korea (Chosen)	100,443
Luxembourg	27,793
Netherlands	849,133
Norway	410,600
Philippines	6,057,961
Poland	287,769,989
Sweden	549,066
Switzerland	1,802,644
U. S. S. R.	139,197,001
International organizations such as Intergovernmental Committee on Refugees	216,365,929
Various unclassified areas	50,621,151
Yugoslavia	257,251,503
Grand total	1,875,007,484

Mr. McCLELLAN. The next table, No. 8, Mr. President, refers to lend-lease which we have expended during that same period of time, from July 1, 1945, through December 1946, in the amount of \$1,438,970,972. The table gives the names of the nations and the amount of lend-lease provided for each.

I ask unanimous consent for its insertion at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 8.—Lend-lease fiscal operations—Loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the Office of Lend-Lease, fiscal operations for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946

Australia (property credits)	\$500,000
China (property credits)	58,900,000
France (property credits)	420,000,000
Iran (property credits)	8,541,041
Liberia (property credits)	6,775,000
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (property credits)	241,560,000
United Kingdom (property credits)	590,000,000
South America, unclassified (property credits)	715,150
Italy (relief supplies)	111,979,781
Total	1,438,970,972

¹ This Office maintains accounts and other fiscal records relating to lend-lease and reverse lend-lease and is under direct supervision of the Treasury.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Table No. 9 shows the loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the Office of the Foreign Liquidation Commission for the

period July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946, totaling \$1,005,458,616.

I ask unanimous consent for the insertion of the table in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Figures from clearing house of foreign transactions, Department of Commerce]

TABLE 9.—Office of Foreign Liquidation Commission—Loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the Office of the Foreign Liquidation Commission for the period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946

Brazil (property credit)	\$8,000,000
Colombia (property credit)	800,000
Panama (property credit)	121,000
Uruguay (property credit)	666,000
Austria (property credit)	10,000,000
Belgium (property credit)	49,000,000
United Kingdom (property credit)	60,000,000
Australia (property credit)	6,500,000
New Zealand (property credit)	5,500,000
China (property credit)	15,000,000
Czechoslovakia (property credit)	50,000,000
Egypt (property credit)	11,000,000
Ethiopia (property credit)	1,000,000
Finland (property credit)	15,000,000
France (property credit)	300,000,000
Greece (property credit)	45,000,000
Hungary (property credit)	15,000,000
Iran (property credit)	4,390,607
Italy (property credit)	160,000,000
Japan (property credit)	15,000,000
Chosen (property credit)	25,000,000
Lebanon (property credit)	5,000,000
Netherlands (property credit)	20,000,000
Netherlands Indies (property credit)	100,000,000
Philippines (property credit)	681,009
Poland (property credit)	50,000,000
Saudi Arabia (property credit)	2,000,000
Siam (property credit)	10,000,000
Turkey (property credit)	10,000,000
Total	1,005,458,616

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the next table, No. 10, shows the relief loans, credits and so forth, advanced by the United States Maritime Commission to the countries that receive such assistance, in the total amount of \$107,197,511. I ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 10.—U. S. Maritime Commission—Loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the Maritime Commission for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946

Brazil (property credit)	\$9,367,137
Peru (property credit)	4,103,547
France (property credit)	30,891,351
Greece (property credit)	23,708,903
Italy (property credit)	20,437,660
Norway (property credit)	15,904,101
Turkey (property credit)	2,784,812
Total	107,197,511

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, table No. 11 shows the relief loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the United States Department of Agriculture for the period July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946. I ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 11.—U. S. Department of Agriculture—Loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the United States Department of Agriculture for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946

Cuba (advance).....	\$384,120,686
Peru (advance).....	50,000
Philippines (advance).....	8,484,500
Total.....	392,655,186

Mr. McCLELLAN. Table No. 12 refers to the loan made by our Government to the Philippines in the amount \$25,000,000. I ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 12.—Reconstruction Finance Corporation—Loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946

Philippines (loan).....	\$25,000,000
-------------------------	--------------

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, table No. 13 lists the loans, property credits, and advances to various countries through the U. S. Commercial Company for the same period, July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946, in the amount of \$7,458,532. I ask unanimous consent for its insertion at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 13.—U. S. Commercial Company—Loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the U. S. Commercial Company for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946

Chile (advance).....	\$6,447,387
Colombia (advance).....	26,507
Ecuador (loan).....	5,190
Mexico (advance).....	204,786
Nicaragua (advance).....	8,664
British Honduras (loan).....	13,497
Canada (advance).....	244,582
Northern Rhodesia (advance).....	14,953
Sierra Leone (advance).....	492,966
Total.....	7,458,532

¹ A subsidiary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and engaged on special export-import projects for the Army, Department of State, and other agencies in liberated areas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, table No. 14 shows loans and advances we have made to certain countries through the Metals Reserve in the amount of \$19,926,745. I ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 14.—Office of Metals Reserve—Loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the Office of Metals Reserve for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946

Bolivia (advance).....	\$150,000
Mexico (advance).....	6,146,745
Peru (advance).....	275,000
Canada (advance).....	11,955,000
South Africa (advance).....	1,400,000
Total.....	19,926,745

¹ Connected with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the purchasing of critical metals and minerals.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Table 15 shows advances and credits of the same nature made for the same period of time by the Office of Rubber Reserve in the amount of \$6,406,904.

I ask unanimous consent for its insertion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 15.—Office of Rubber Reserve—Loans, property credits, and advances to foreign countries by the Office of Rubber Reserve for period July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946

Bolivia (advance).....	\$2,682,138
Brazil (property credit).....	1,964,773
Brazil (advance).....	475
Colombia (advance).....	981,099
Guatemala (advance).....	33,674
Panama (advance).....	22,898
Peru (advance).....	171,887
Venezuela (advance).....	490,105
Philippines (advance).....	3,000
Total.....	6,406,904

¹ Connected with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the purchasing of crude rubber and the manufacture of synthetic rubber.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, with respect to the advances by Rubber Reserve and Metals Reserve, of course, we can regard them as definite investments from which we can expect to receive full value in return. That, however, does not hold true with many of the other credits and advances to which I have referred.

Table No. 16 shows credits authorized by the Export-Import Bank for the period July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946. I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 16.—Credits authorized by Export-Import Bank for period July 1, 1945-Dec. 31, 1946, by country

AMERICAN REPUBLICS	
Argentina.....	\$190,000
Brazil.....	46,060,000
Chile.....	47,350,000
Colombia.....	3,520,000
Ecuador.....	1,780,000
Mexico.....	37,340,000
Peru.....	2,450,000
Total.....	138,690,000

EUROPE	
Belgium.....	\$100,000,000
Czechoslovakia.....	2,000,000
Denmark.....	20,000,000
Finland.....	35,000,000
France.....	1,200,000,000
Greece.....	25,000,000
The Netherlands.....	300,000,000
Norway.....	50,000,000
Poland.....	40,000,000
Other European countries.....	100,000,000
Total.....	1,872,000,000

ASIA	
China.....	\$66,790,000
Netherlands Indies.....	100,000,000
Saudi Arabia.....	30,000,000
Turkey.....	28,060,000
Total.....	224,850,000

VARIOUS COUNTRIES

Canada.....	\$5,700,000
Ethiopia.....	3,000,000
Smaller countries.....	5,000,000
Special exporter-importer credits.....	1,470,000
Total.....	15,170,000
Grand total.....	2,250,710,000

CREDITS AUTHORIZED IN 1947 TILL FEB. 28, 1947

Brazil.....	\$9,562,500
Finland.....	37,500,000
Italy.....	105,000,000
Austria.....	750,000
Total for 1947.....	152,812,500

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wonder if the Senator from Arkansas has read the last report of the Export-Import Bank on the overall extension of credits direct and indirect in 1946 and 1947. If not, I wish to call his attention to the fact that that report shows that in the year 1946 we gave abroad, in goods and services, \$8,200,000,000 more than we got back. It is estimated that in the year 1947 we will give \$7,000,000,000 more of goods and services, including exports and the furnishing of services, and approximately half a billion dollars spent by the Army abroad, than the value of the things that we get back in the United States. I wonder how long the Senator thinks we can continue passing out our assets at the rate of \$7,000,000,000 or \$8,000,000,000 a year to foreign countries without return.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, that question gives me considerable concern. I think it is time for us to take some stock of the contributions which we are making abroad, and use a little more effort in trying to do it on a businesslike basis and with some hope, at least, of getting some of it back after it has been expended. That is what gives me so much concern. I think this country owes an obligation to the world, in view of our financial situation. I think the call of humanity appeals to all of us, and that we feel compelled, and desire to give assistance; but before I conclude I wish to emphasize some assistance that we have given in the past and are continuing to give, which does not comport consistently with the measures now before Congress for further relief, in their present form. They ought to be amended if enacted, in order to protect our interest and to be consistent with our welfare and national security.

Mr. President, I offer table No. 17 to be incorporated in the RECORD. It is a further analysis of our contributions to the Export-Import Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 17.—Advances to three banks since July 1, 1945

1. EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

An additional lending authority of \$2,800,000,000 was granted by Congress under the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945. Credits

authorized during the period July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946, amounted to \$2,250,000,000 with an undisbursed total of \$550,000,000.

2. INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Against a total subscription of \$8,800,000,000 the United States committed itself to a quota of \$2,750,000,000. By November 1946, the United States had deposited \$5,275,000. The balance of the United States Government subscription was paid on February 26, 1947, as follows: \$687,500,000 in gold, \$275,225,000 in cash, \$1,782,000,000 in non-interest-bearing notes.

3. INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Against an authorized capital of \$10,000,000,000 the 44 member nations represented at Bretton Woods contracted to subscribe \$9,100,000,000. Against this total the United States committed itself to a quota of \$3,175,000,000.

During November 1946, the second 5-percent payment of \$158,750,000 was made to the Bank. Total payments up to December 31, 1946, equaled \$317,500,000. The third 5-percent payment was made on February 25, 1947, and the fourth will be made by May 26, 1947. Thus by June 30, 1947, the United States Government will have completed its entire 20-percent subscription of \$635,000,000. The remaining \$2,540,000,000 represent a contingent obligation only.

No loans have been granted to any country as of March 21, 1947. However, applications for loans and letters of intent are as follows:

Chile (for development).....	\$40,000,000
Czechoslovakia (for reconstruction).....	350,000,000
Denmark (for reconstruction).....	50,000,000
France (for reconstruction).....	500,000,000
Iran (for development).....	250,000,000
Luxemburg (for reconstruction).....	20,000,000
Netherlands (for reconstruction).....	500,000,000
Poland (for reconstruction).....	600,000,000
Total.....	2,310,000,000

RECAPITULATION

Payments July 1, 1945-Dec. 31, 1946:

Export-Import Bank.....	\$2,250,710,000
International Monetary Fund.....	5,275,000
International Bank.....	317,500,000
Total.....	2,573,485,000

Payments since Jan. 1, 1947:

Export-Import Bank.....	152,812,500
International Monetary Fund.....	2,744,725,000
International Bank.....	317,500,000
Total.....	3,215,037,500

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, while no loans have yet been granted to any of the countries as of March 21, 1947, from the International Bank fund, there are pending applications for loans in the amount of \$2,310,000,000. Among the applications for loans are applications from Czechoslovakia, which asks for \$350,000,000, and from Poland, which is asking for \$600,000,000. We all remember that we voted to lend Great Britain \$3,750,000,000. This information is shown on table 18, which I now offer for the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 18.—U. S. Department of the Treasury
Loan to the United Kingdom. \$3,750,000,000

Mr. McCLELLAN. Table 19 shows a break-down of relief expenditures by the War Department since the cessation of hostilities, by countries, from August 11, 1945, to December 31, 1946, and also anticipated War Department relief expenditures, by countries, from January 1, 1947, to June 30, 1947, in the amount of \$457,851,000. I ask unanimous consent to have table 19 printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 19.—Relief expenditures by War Department since cessation of hostilities by country, Aug. 11, 1945-Dec. 31, 1946

Germany (United States zone).....	\$524,221,233.26
Austria (United States zone).....	50,938,682.55
Japan.....	176,054,237.73
Korea.....	30,850,705.33
Ryukyu Islands.....	1,110,992.00
Udine (Italy).....	7,738,587.39
Venezia Giulia (Italy).....	11,119,747.25
Total.....	802,034,187.51

ANTICIPATED WAR DEPARTMENT RELIEF EXPENDITURES BY COUNTRY, JAN. 1-JUNE 30, 1947

Austria (United States zone).....	\$12,443,000
Germany (United States zone).....	97,961,000
Venezia Giulia and Udine.....	8,819,000
Japan and Korea.....	338,628,000
Total.....	457,851,000

These totals represent dollar value of goods, commodities, etc. They include actual shipments from the United States, transfers from military stock piles in respective countries, and transfers from the stock pile created by the United States, England, and Canada during the war in Europe and the Far East.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a few moments ago I referred to the assistance which had been provided through UNRRA for Russia and a number of other nations which we regard as being definitely under her domination. I now offer for the RECORD table 20, which shows the assistance which we have given through UNRRA, lend-lease, the Export-Import Bank credits, and possibly other agencies, from July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946, to Russia, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia. The total amount is \$1,250,207,512.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 20.—United States assistance to the U. S. S. R. and satellite nations (in dollar value) from July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946

Russia:	
UNRRA.....	\$139,197,001
Lend-lease (property credits).....	241,560,000
Total.....	380,757,001
Albania: UNRRA.....	15,774,928
Czechoslovakia:	
UNRRA.....	150,362,106
Office Foreign Liquidation Commission.....	50,000,000
Export - Import Bank credits.....	2,000,000
Total.....	202,362,106

Hungary:	
UNRRA.....	\$1,291,985
Office Foreign Liquidation Commission.....	15,000,000
Total.....	16,291,985

Poland:	
UNRRA.....	287,769,989
Office Foreign Liquidation Commission.....	50,000,000
Export - Import Bank credits.....	40,000,000
Total.....	377,769,989

Yugoslavia: UNRRA.....	257,251,503
------------------------	-------------

Total assistance to Russia in dollar value.....	380,757,001
Total assistance to Russia's satellite nations in dollar value.....	869,450,511

Grand total in dollar value.....	1,250,207,512
-----------------------------------------	----------------------

Totals by classification of assistance:

UNRRA.....	851,647,512
Office Foreign Liquidation Commission.....	115,000,000
Lend-lease (property credits).....	241,560,000
Export - Import Bank credits.....	42,000,000

Grand total.....	1,250,207,512
-------------------------	----------------------

In addition, United States assistance, amounting to \$99,362,817, was given to Austria, a fourth of which is dominated by Russian influence. This total was divided as follows: UNRRA, \$34,716,234; Office Foreign Liquidation Commission, \$10,000,000 (as property credit); and War Department civilian relief, \$54,646,583.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I find from certain figures, to which I am referring in advance, that under our present commitments the anticipated expenditures from January 1947 through June 30, 1947, to Russia and her satellite nations will be \$557,500,000. That makes a total, within 2 years after the cessation of hostilities, of \$1,807,707,000 that Russia and the nations under her domination will have received.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. The Senator has been ably presenting figures showing the cost to the United States Government of foreign loans and relief. In that connection I should like to relate something which occurred about a year ago. A soldier in Korea wrote to me stating that we were furnishing vast quantities of food, and it was not even labeled as coming from the United States. I took the matter up with the State Department, and sometime later the State Department agreed to label all our food relief as coming from the United States.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to submit, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] an amendment to House Joint Resolution 153, which would make possible the labeling of all our relief, no matter where it goes in the world.

There being no objection, the amendment submitted by Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. McCLELLAN) to the joint

resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator. I cannot help feeling that the situation to which the Senator from North Dakota refers is one of the great mistakes we made in connection with the administration of UNRRA. When we add the lend-lease supplies which went to UNRRA, we provided at least 70 percent, and possibly more, of the relief given by UNRRA. From reports which I have received from those in a position to know, very often we received no credit whatsoever. The people who received the goods and the relief and assistance never knew that this great democracy of ours, this capitalistic system which some so violently condemn, was the source of the very food and other necessities that kept them alive.

Mr. President, the time has come when the peoples of the world should know the source from which relief is coming, and who is alleviating their distress. I am happy to join with the Senator from North Dakota in submitting this amendment to the general relief measure, so that henceforth when we spend the money of American taxpayers to render aid and relief to peoples who are in distress, they may know where it comes from.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point table 21, a tentative estimate of assistance to be rendered to certain European countries by the United States during the period January 1, 1947, through June 30, 1947. This table is a break-down of the figures which I have just submitted.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 21.—Tentative estimate of assistance to be rendered to certain European countries¹ by the United States during the period Jan. 1 through June 30, 1947

UNRRA (to all Russian-influenced Europe).....	\$200,000,000
Export-Import Bank.....	40,000,000
United States portion, International Bank.....	317,500,000
Total.....	557,500,000
Aid rendered July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1947.....	1,250,207,512
Grand total.....	1,807,707,512

¹ European countries which are predominantly influenced by Russia in their political and economic actions. (Satellites are those nations rotating in the orbit of Russian influence.) Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, and Finland, plus Russian-occupied zones of Germany and Austria.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, to recapitulate a bit in connection with the figures which I have submitted, the total expenditures from July 1, 1945, to December 31, 1946, amounted to \$12,066,215,311. The total anticipated expenditures or commitments which have already been made from January 1, 1947, through June 30, 1947, not including the three pending relief measures, amount to \$4,721,876,000,

making a total of \$16,788,091,000 of cost to this Government for foreign aid and assistance during the 2-year period following the war.

Mr. President, in connection with the foregoing I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a table headed "Recapitulation of United States financial assistance to all foreign nations since July 1, 1945."

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Recapitulation of United States financial assistance to all foreign nations since July 1, 1945

Total expenditures from July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946.....	\$12,066,215,311
Total anticipated expenditures or commitments from Jan. 1, 1947, through June 30, 1947, not including the 3 pending measures.....	4,721,876,000
Expenditures from July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946, plus expenditures or commitments scheduled through June 30, 1947.....	16,788,091,000

RUSSIA AND FIVE SATELLITE NATIONS

Total expenditures from July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946, to Russia and 5 of her satellite nations—governments politically and economically dominated by Russian influence.....	1,250,207,512
Total commitments and anticipated expenditures from Jan. 1, 1947, through June 30, 1947, to Russia and 5 satellite nations.....	557,500,000
Total expenditures from July 1, 1945, through Dec. 31, 1946, plus expenditures or commitments scheduled through June 30, 1947.....	1,807,707,000

NOTE.—Total expenditures to Russia and satellite nations is approximately one-eighth, or 12½ percent, of all expenditures abroad for relief and assistance.

Of the \$16,788,091,000 grand total, the United States expects to get back some \$12,990,000,000 as repayment on loans, advances, credits, etc. This leaves total in grants of approximately \$4,000,000,000 which the United States will never get back. How much, if any of the other twelve billions, will ever be repaid is highly speculative, and we stand the chance of losing substantially all of it.

Total expenditures to Greece during period July 1, 1940, through Dec. 31, 1946, amounted to \$407,481,063.

TOTAL EXPENDITURES REQUESTED OF EIGHTIETH CONGRESS FOR FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

International Refugee Organization (H. J. Res. 77), \$75,000,000; the President's world relief bill (H. J. Res. 153), \$350,000,000; and aid to Greece and Turkey (S. 938), \$400,000,000; total, \$825,000,000.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have already given the figures with respect to the amount of aid which Russia has received and will have received by June 30, 1947. When I say Russia, I mean Russia and those countries which are under her control and domination, economically and politically. The figures amount to \$1,807,707,000.

Mr. President, the three pending relief measures carry with them an authoriza-

tion, if they are enacted into law, of a total of \$825,000,000 additional relief.

After studying these figures and statistics and recognizing their proper significance, I approach favorable consideration of the three pending relief measures with some reluctance. I may support their final enactment for reasons which are compelling, but which are not necessarily associated directly with relief.

With respect to aid for Greece and Turkey, taking all factors into account, it may be the better course of wisdom and definitely in our national interest and security to assist Greece and Turkey to withstand the foreign pressure of communism. If I conclude that this is true, I shall support the enactment of the measures; but, Mr. President, with respect to the proposal that this Nation spend another \$350,000,000 for relief in the nature of UNRRA and in continuation of that program of general relief to war-devastated countries, I have some very definite reservations. I am highly gratified that the President of the United States did not recommend a continuation of UNRRA as such, but rather that our own Government direct and supervise the expenditure of these additional funds independently of UNRRA or any other international organization or government. I opposed the original UNRRA bill because of the way it was to be established and administered. I felt that if our Government was to spend billions of dollars, representing 70 percent or more of the total expenditures which would be made from all sources for relief of distressed peoples, we should spend that money in our own name and under our own direction and supervision, in order that the people to whom relief was afforded might know and understand that the assistance was being given to them by our Government, by the greatest democracy on earth, so, Mr. President, that they might have a better appreciation and knowledge of the productive capacity that this Nation has under its free-enterprise system as compared with all other governments and countries whose ideologies clash with ours and who constantly and bitterly criticize and condemn democracies and the capitalistic system of free enterprise.

Mr. President, that money has already been spent. We cannot recall it now. I think we know that a large portion of it and the goods which were provided by us and distributed in foreign countries by UNRRA in many instances did not reach the needy and alleviate the suffering which it was intended to relieve; and certainly this Nation did not and has not yet received due credit for the contributions which it has made to the relief of human distress and for the assistance it has undertaken to give for the reconstruction and rehabilitation of the devastated areas in Europe.

Mr. President, it is interesting to note from the figures that I have supplied that Russia, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and Yugoslavia received \$851,647,512 or 45 percent of the UNRRA funds which our Government contributed. Total assistance given by our Government to these nations since July 1, 1945, through December 31, 1946, amounts to \$1,250,207,512. In addition

to this, it is anticipated that through commitments already made and expected to be made, Russia and the five satellite nations will receive an additional \$557,500,000 in assistance from our Government during the period January 1 to June 30, 1947, making a total, Mr. President, of \$1,807,707,000 that this Government will have expended in or contributed to these nations for assistance, relief, and reconstruction within a 2-year period since July 1, 1945.

Mr. President, we are now asked to spend \$400,000,000 in Greece and Turkey, a considerable part of which it is intended will be used for armaments and military purposes to strengthen the defense of these countries in order to enable them to resist pressure from without—pressure, Mr. President, from the very sources to which we have so generously contributed more than \$1,800,000,000. It is incompatible and inconsistent for us, Mr. President, to make loans or grants to assist weaker nations to maintain military strength to enable them to resist pressures from without and at the same time contribute relief funds to those countries, governments, and peoples who are known to be applying the pressure against these weaker nations.

Therefore, Mr. President, we propose an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 153, which is intended to prohibit the expenditure of any part of the \$350,000,000 as proposed additional relief funds to the Governments or peoples of Russia, Albania, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Bulgaria.

Mr. President, I am not at all unmindful of the humanitarian considerations that attend and are associated with these relief measures. I should like to see relief provided, of course, to all distressed peoples and to all suffering humanity, but, Mr. President, I cannot vote for relief appropriations to be paid from the earnings of the taxpayers of this Nation to relieve distressed peoples of a nation—and those who are under her political and economic dominance and control—that is able to spend billions and billions of dollars for war purposes so that she can carry on policies of pressure and aggression against weaker nations. According to an Associated Press dispatch carried in the New York Times on February 20, 1947, bearing a London date line, the Moscow radio was quoted as having announced that Russia's military expenditures for 1947 would total 67,000,000,000 rubles, or approximately \$13,300,000,000. This sum, Mr. President, is more than \$2,000,000,000 in excess of what we propose to expend on our Military Establishments during the next fiscal year. In all probability, many other billions of rubles being spent by Russia in some form or another, although not listed as military expenditures, nevertheless are either directly or indirectly used for that purpose.

Mr. President, if Russia can spend these billions in order to keep her military strength at such a point that she can apply pressure upon weaker nations and can undertake to spread communism and pursue policies of aggression, and as long as she keeps the iron curtain drawn in the face of the rest of the world

and keeps concealed her plans and her aggressive program and the preparations she is making for world revolution, I cannot with good conscience bring myself to vote for one dime of appropriation and expenditures which will go for relief or any sort of assistance to her and to countries which are under her domination. The more we spend in that way, the greater strength we help her build and the more power and pressure she will be able to wield. We are just beginning the program of aid to Greece and Turkey. I do not know that it will stop there; in all probability this is only the beginning. If we spend \$400,000,000 now, and more later, to build their military strength or to give them relief from their distress, and to enable them to resist the pressure to which I have referred, then, Mr. President, every dollar we spend in the other nations I have mentioned, regardless of whether we spend it under the head of relief or for any other purpose, will simply be building up the very strength and power we now undertake to oppose.

Mr. President, at the proper time, when House Joint Resolution 153 comes up in this body for consideration, I shall offer the amendment which I now send to the desk, and I shall earnestly urge its adoption. I now ask unanimous consent that the amendment be received, printed, and lie on the table.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. McCLELLAN to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 153) providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war, was received, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the cuts in the appropriations for the Department of Labor proposed in House bill 2700, and now before the Senate Appropriations Committee, constitute so serious a threat to the national economy, welfare, and security that I propose to call the attention of the Members to the principal features of this so-called economy proposal. I hope that an ounce of nonpartisan or bipartisan prevention in the Senate Appropriations Committee will make unnecessary a pound of cure on the floor of the Senate. In my remarks, I shall endeavor to be nonpartisan.

My brilliant colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], has already called the attention of his party to the damage the proposed cuts would do to our national economy and to the interest of employers and employees, alike. I am sure that other Members of the majority party will likewise give thought to the seriousness of the proposed budget cuts. As the junior Senator from Oregon said of the 77 percent cut in the budget for the United States Employment Service, from \$3,900,000 to \$900,000, "This is not fiscal therapy, this is not surgery; I think it is butchery of the welfare of the workers of this country."

This statement, in my judgment, applies with equal force to the entire pro-

posal for reducing the Labor Department's 1948 budget request by 43 percent. The effect, were this House proposal to prevail, would be the destruction of the Labor Department as an effective agency charged with protecting and promoting the welfare of wage earners of the Nation. This is not economy, Mr. President; this is part of a reckless plan which, I prefer to believe, will fail in the Senate. It appears to be part of a concerted effort to destroy by indirection all the labor and social legislation passed in the last 14 years.

I prefer to believe that Members on both sides of the aisle will reject this attempt to turn back the clock. I would point out that, should the attempt by some mischance succeed, the clock would be turned back, not just to 1932, but to 1920. Is that what the Members of the Eightieth Congress want to do? Do we want to go before the country in 1948 with such a record of destruction? That question is in order in considering, as a specimen, the proposed cuts in the Labor Department budget.

Mr. President, I would remind the Members of the Senate that the Labor Department was a creation, not of a Democratic administration, but of a Republican administration. The act creating this Department, the youngest and still the smallest of all Departments, was passed by a Republican Congress. That act was the last major item signed into law by the retiring President of the United States in 1913, the father of the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who is both the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Welfare, and chairman of the steering committee for the majority party.

Mr. President, I ask the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to give attention to the mangled remnants of the Labor Department budget as it is now being examined by the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee. I ask him to see for himself the vital importance of the functions that would be abolished or made ineffective were these proposed slashes to remain, and then to relate the effect of such liquidation of the Department created in the administration of his father upon the whole problem of industrial relations to which the senior Senator from Ohio has devoted more than 3 months of hearings and study. I believe that if he will examine the record, the responsibilities, and the needs for the various services of the Labor Department's divisions and bureaus, he must reach the conclusion that any reduction in the requested \$103,000,000 budget—\$72,000,000 of which is for grants to States for their employment services, leaving a net budget for Federal functions of less than \$32,000,000—would not be economy in any real sense of the word, but would, in fact, cost the Nation's industry and even the Federal Treasury many times the amount of the proposed reduction of nearly \$14,000,000.

Before examining the cuts proposed in House bill 2700, let me point out that the Labor Department was designed and created to serve the Nation's wage and salary earners and employers. These wage and salary earners now total nearly 50,000,000. The requested budget of

\$103,000,000, compared with the proposed budget for the Department of Agriculture of \$900,000,000 does not look extravagant. The Agriculture Department's budget in past years has reached \$1,000,000,000, whereas the Department of Labor's budget has never exceeded one hundred and fifty millions. Let me say in passing that I think every dollar of the Department of Agriculture's budget has been and will be well spent in conserving our agricultural resources, of which the most important are the farm people themselves, some 27,000,000 in number. But I submit that the comparison of the budgets for the two Departments, \$103,000,000 for Labor and \$900,000,000 for Agriculture, speaks for itself. It should make each one of us examine carefully every proposed reduction in the budget for the Labor Department. I say this because I have long felt that if we had a Labor Department as well adapted to the needs of wage earners as the Department of Agriculture is adapted to the needs of the American farmers, we would have fewer costly interruptions of production, of wages, of markets, and fewer drains upon our entire economy, including the United States Treasury itself. Thus, adequate expenditure for maintaining necessary services in the Department of Labor would pay dividends to every group, including industry, business, and the farmers, whose markets fundamentally depend upon the ability of wage earners to buy the foods and fibers that our farms produce.

CUTTING \$14,000,000 FROM \$32,000,000

Let us see what happened to the budget of the United States Department of Labor. The 1948 budget requests for the Department of Labor for operating purposes amount to \$31,850,700. This amount was not reached by considering the needs of that Department as an isolated and unrelated function of Government. It was based upon the relative needs of all functions of Government in comparison with the Department of Labor. By adopting this method we are sure we get from Government the very best that money can buy of those kinds of services which the public wants and needs the most.

But what does H. R. 2700 do to that \$32,000,000 requested for the Department of Labor? It sliced it by almost \$14,000,000, and sent to the Senate an appropriation measure reducing the Department of Labor's operating funds by 43 percent. The recklessness of this sort of action is obvious. Here we are considering an appropriation of funds for the smallest department of Government, which is saddled with problems we all recognize as the most pressing domestic issues of our time. And to help meet these problems, the House proceeds to cut almost in half the budgetary request for that Department, which has under it the services needed in solving the problems of industrial relations, wages and hours, and employment services. It seems to me that this kind of reasoning comes pretty close to mental bankruptcy.

There are many points which I wish to emphasize today in relation to this atrocious piece of penny-pinching ex-

travagance. I cannot overlook, for instance, the cavalier and unthinking methods used to make these cuts. Why, in one instance, by voice vote, an additional \$1,000,000 has been stripped from funds of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, already reduced 50 percent by committee action, without even a moment's hesitation to consider the purposes for which this million dollars would have been used. A point which is most singular about this act of budgetary butchery, and therefore deserving of emphasis, is the fact that industry—which includes the employer himself—will be most severely hit by these cuts in the Department of Labor.

UNITED STATES EMPLOYMENT SERVICE ACT CUT 77 PERCENT

Because it reveals most flagrantly the character of the attack upon the Department of Labor, I want first to describe the nature and extent of the cuts in the budget for the United States Employment Service. Mr. President, if ever there was an instance of "economy on a binge," to quote the junior Senator from Oregon, this is it.

The House, in appropriating funds for the public employment service, has allowed every penny requested for the running of local employment offices by the States—\$72,000,000—but has slashed 77 percent the funds requested by the Federal Government for running the national office. I repeat, grants for the States—\$72,000,000—were cut not one cent; but funds for the USES—\$3,900,000—were slashed 77 percent. Put another way—\$72,000,000 requested to run State and local employment offices were granted 100 percent; but \$3,900,000 requested to run the national office were granted only 23 percent. And where does the money come from for both the local and the national offices? Out of the Federal Treasury. It comes 100 percent out of the Federal Treasury. The Federal Government grants to the States all they need, but to the national office only 23 percent of what it needs.

It was my understanding, when the Seventy-ninth Congress voted to return operations of our public employment offices to the States, that the United States Employment Service, which is the national office of our Federal-State employment service system, would continue to perform in accordance with the responsibilities given to the Federal Government by the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944. Action, however, by the other body of this Congress compels one to conclude that there is a desire on the part of some to repeal these acts of Congress by denying all but token funds to the USES.

It is important that members of this body appreciate the full implications of a 77 percent budget slash in appropriations for the United States Employment Service.

It is particularly important that this body review the work of the USES and what the USES supplies to affiliated State Employment Services; and that we take the relationship of the USES to the national economy into account in determining this appropriation, lest the Eight-

tieth Congress destroy a service whose cost is minor compared to its contribution in dollars and cents to employers, workers, and to the Nation in maintaining a high level of production.

During my years of service in the House, I became personally acquainted with the work of the USES and with some of the ways in which it has served millions of workers and employers. I became particularly interested in the work of the USES because of my interest in the welfare of physically handicapped persons, both those disabled in the service of our country and those handicapped by accident and disease here at home.

The Federal-State system of our public employment service may be likened to an automobile. The motor is the national office; the chassis and the body are the State and local offices. Mr. President, the motor can be taken out of an automobile, and the automobile without the motor can still run—but only down hill. In effect, denying appropriations to the USES is taking the motor out of the Federal-State employment service, and I am sure that if this is done, the system may still run—but down hill.

Services which are today being performed by the USES for State Employment Services and for the Veterans' Employment Service are not new. The USES has been in operation since 1933. I can see no need of change in the original role of the USES that would be required by the recent return of the operations of employment offices to the States.

For each of the 1,800 local offices, or for each of the 48 State systems of the public employment service, to develop and keep current reliable dictionaries of occupational titles—such as the USES produced for all the States—would be utter folly. It is easy to see that it would be not only impractical but outrageously uneconomical for the 48 State services to develop their own and differing operating forms, job tests of various sorts, training materials, manuals of operation, job descriptions, and the many other scientific devices essential in the process of getting workers into jobs that utilize their skills and abilities.

In our modern economy, the successful placing of workers on jobs cannot be conducted as a catch-as-catch-can business. You have to have accurate and proven job descriptions. The worker's skills and qualifications have to be matched against the job requirements specified by the employer. This is possible in every local office throughout the country because of the basic occupational analysis work done by the USES in cooperation with State and local offices. The USES has organized these facts in the Dictionary of Occupational Titles which is a basic tool for all employment-service activities. As one writer put it:

Without it, our industrial war effort conceivably might have earned the melancholy footnote of history—too little and too late. The Occupational Dictionary's importance to the future is hardly calculable.

I wish permission to insert in the RECORD the article from which I have just quoted and which appeared in the January 30, 1943 edition of the Saturday

Evening Post under the title "The Book That Went to War." I ask unanimous consent that that be inserted at the end of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record. (See exhibit A.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. But workers are not placed in satisfactory employment solely on the basis of job descriptions. The USES has developed and supplies to local offices oral trade questions and aptitude tests in order to assist workers in jobs for which they are qualified. The United States Employment Service also analyzes and distributes to all offices information on job opportunities for specific occupations, industries, and labor-market areas.

This type of activity is clearly required in the basic law and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act and is a prerequisite to the maintenance of a Nation-wide network of employment offices and the coordination of their activity. Yet the proposal in H. R. 2700 would make the USES incapable of carrying out this specific responsibility. No economy would be effected, for the States would have to attempt to supply for themselves at a tremendous increase in cost comparable materials that are so essential to the operation of public employment offices.

I said earlier that I am familiar with the work of the United States Employment Service in aiding the physically handicapped citizens of the Nation. Since 1941, through the initiative of the United States Employment Service, over a million and a quarter such handicapped persons have been assisted in securing employment. During the war handicapped workers filled the gap in hard-pressed manpower needs of war industry. They have earned a permanent place in our economy. A large part of their achievement is attributable to the improved tools developed by the USES and used by all the local offices throughout the country. The approach has been to analyze the physical requirements of each occupation and measure the capacity of the handicapped individual against these requirements. It is an intelligent approach. It is a human approach. The Employment Service does not start with what a man has lost but with what he has left. That, they say, is what counts.

Because of the work of the USES, the disabled war veteran and other handicapped workers are not being placed in makeshift jobs, or are not being put on merely as watchmen or doorkeepers. They are being employed in all occupations—professional and semiprofessional, technical, clerical, and in trades and services of the Nation. They have been assisted to become self-supporting, tax-paying citizens rather than being condemned to idleness in homes and institutions.

It is not too much to say that without the work done by the USES, the employment-counseling program for veterans, displaced industrial workers, and youth, and the program for placement of disabled veterans and other handicapped workers, never would have been established on a Nation-wide basis as they are today. In the development of these pro-

grams, the USES has provided the necessary leadership to coordinate the activities of the affiliated State services in order to develop basic techniques, information, and procedures for these programs. Without the USES participation, these programs required by law would have been years in getting underway. Without the continued USES participation, they would deteriorate rapidly.

The record of this effort speaks for itself. In 1941, 27,000 handicapped workers were placed through the employment service, a tenfold increase in 5 years. Such things cannot happen by accident. This record is a result of a concerted effort.

I know for a fact that these efforts must come to an immediate end unless the Senate restores the funds to the USES.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS CUT 60 PERCENT

Deep and unreasoning slashes in the appropriations for the Bureau of Labor Statistics are equally damaging to employers. The budget originally called for \$6,700,700 for this expert fact-finding arm of Government. When the appropriation bill reached the Senate, however, it contained an allotment of only \$2,373,400, or a cut of approximately 60 percent.

It seems to me that, to deserve this kind of blow, an agency of Government must be generally recognized as next to useless to the public. But the facts show the exact opposite. Both before and during the war years the Bureau of Labor Statistics has been the brain center for collecting and analyzing statistics on our domestic economy and its relation to the economics of other nations.

Cost-of-living indexes, family budget estimates, employment and pay-roll statistics, occupational wage rates and wage-rate trends, measurement of productivity, housing and construction statistics, and wholesale price indexes have provided the Government and business in general with invaluable means for charting future business trends.

These services and also detailed information on collective bargaining agreements have aided immeasurably in the settlement of industrial disputes.

It would be impossible for Congress, for industry, and for labor to plan for our future unless these vital services are continued. Again I want to stress the harm particularly to employers who, as the business-guiding group of the management-labor partnership, have as urgent a need and as avid an interest in these figures as any other group in our democracy.

I notice that the report accompanying H. R. 2700 in the House, which recommended cuts in the Bureau of Labor Statistics, gave as its reason the growth of the Bureau far beyond its original size under the law establishing it. This may be true. But it does not support a cut—rather, it seems to argue for an increase. The Bureau has year after year been charged by the Congress with increasing functions, as the reputation of the agency for accuracy and excellence grew with the years. The only reason that I can see for its present broad operations is the recognition time and again by Congress

that the Government must discharge intricate economic fact-finding obligations. Why, only recently the Congress passed the Employment Act of 1946 requiring constant governmental appraisal of prices, wages, employment, and productivity. It so happens that the Bureau of Labor Statistics is one of the most efficient existing organizations for this purpose.

It is obvious that a 60-percent cut in appropriations will make it practically impossible for the Bureau to discharge its functions. This would indeed be a return to original size under the law establishing the Bureau 60 years ago. If anything could be literally a return to the horse and buggy era, this, Mr. President, would be it.

If the proposed cuts are to stand, the Bureau of Labor Statistics would have to cut the monthly national consumer price index to quarterly issues.

Retail food price indexes now available monthly for 56 cities would be issued quarterly for 34 cities.

Dollar cost estimates of family budgets would be discontinued.

The daily index of 28 important commodities would be discontinued.

Monthly national reports on national employment, hours, and pay rolls would be continued but State and area employment statistics would be discontinued.

Local information of wage rates, accepted by both employers and employees as a basis for contract negotiations, would be eliminated.

I need only indicate the result; individual employers, trade associations, chambers of commerce, and unions in cities, States, and regions would be deprived of much up-to-date information needed to plan future operations from month to month and year to year. In my opinion, we would be deliberately putting out our own eyes and tying off areas of our brain. Do the Members of the Senate wish to be a party to such action?

Certainly the Bureau of Labor Statistics has grown. So has our population, our industry, our entire economy, our industrial strength, and position among the nations of the world.

It is sheer folly to attempt to shrink this vital key service in our economy back to what it was at some point in the past.

CONCILIATION SERVICE DECAPITATED AND CUT 25 PERCENT

Now let us consider the Conciliation Service. It is proposed to reduce the appropriation \$598,000, or 25 percent at a time when both bodies of this Congress are seeking ways and means of strengthening the Government's conciliation and mediation efforts. Certainly this is not a time when we want to reduce the number of conciliators who represent the public interest in seeking a peaceful adjustment of labor disputes.

The Conciliation Service did not grow overnight to its present size and importance. It grew slowly in response to strong public demand. Each step along the way is taken with the advice and often at the suggestion of a Labor-Management Advisory Committee composed of working representatives of employers and employees. The Conciliation Service

is what it is because businessmen and labor leaders have asked congress to create and expand it in the public interest.

It came as some surprise to me when just the other day the National Association of Manufacturers not only urged a committee of this Senate to continue the Conciliation Service as an integral part of the Department of Labor, but also expressed the unqualified opinion that the Service must be strengthened along present lines. What better testimony than this, Mr. President, is needed for us to conclude that even conservative employers want these destructive cuts in useful funds restored to the figures requested by the President which themselves are rock-bottom minimums.

Not only does H. R. 2700 propose to reduce the funds for the peaceful settlement of disputes, but, in so doing, it has in effect attempted to order the Secretary of Labor to tear apart that Service and to dismiss virtually its entire administrative and supervisory staff. The report accompanying H. R. 2700, for example, stipulates that none of the Conciliation Service funds for the next fiscal year shall be used to pay the Director, his assistant, the seven regional directors, the seven assistant regional directors, the chief of field operations, the chief of arbitration, the training staff, and one-third of the Service's technical conciliators—to name a few of the 102 specific positions which would be eliminated if the report should become controlling in the expenditure of Conciliation Service funds.

There is little doubt in my mind that this action would be an illegal exercise of the appropriations power. There is no doubt at all that it was unjustified and unwise. What possible good can result from a saving of a half-million dollars in a \$37,000,000,000 budget when that half million is made by practically beheading an admittedly essential agency, leaving little but an amorphous group of conciliators to operate on a free-lance basis, without supervision, without direction, and without guidance? I do not propose to waste the Senate's time in further serious discussion of the administrative feasibility of this act since the real motive is so obvious. That motive, Mr. President, is to do by indirection what the Supreme Court has said cannot be done directly, to fire and blacken the reputation of Federal employees.

It is perfectly proper that this Congress should determine what Federal funds the Secretary of Labor may use in the next fiscal period in his efforts to avert strikes. If the Congress, in its wisdom, wishes to risk additional strikes by reducing the Government's mediation efforts, that is a decision for which each Member must answer to the country.

But under our constitutional form of government the actual operation of the Conciliation Service still must remain the responsibility of the executive branch. If, within the limits of the funds available, the Secretary chooses to decentralize his operation and to conduct his mediation activities outside of Washington and in the communities where the disputes arise, that is his responsibility. For the Congress to attempt through the

exercise of the appropriation power to dictate who shall or shall not be used in the effort is clearly a usurpation of the executive function.

Aside from key policy-making positions subject to confirmation by the Senate, the executive has the sole authority and responsibility for hiring and firing of personnel in the executive branch. Yet the House, through the report of the Appropriation Committee, is here attempting to tell the Secretary of Labor whom he shall hire and fire in the operation of the Conciliation Service.

This attempted usurpation of the Executive authority has caused great alarm throughout the country to all people who believe in the wisdom and practicality of the United States Constitution which specifically separates the executive, legislative, and judicial functions of government, and with good reason.

Mr. President, there has been a great deal of talk by the Members of the Congress about jurisdictional disputes in labor matters. Well, here is a labor matter, and we are here being invited to engage in a jurisdictional dispute with the Secretary of Labor over how he shall organize a division of his Department. I believe we are unanimous in our opposition to destructive jurisdictional disputes. If we expect to maintain the respect of the Nation we had better stick by our principles and recognize the limits of our jurisdiction as set forth in the Constitution of the United States. I can assure the Senate that a jurisdictional dispute of this nature between the Congress and the Executive will be unpopular. To dispel any doubt on that score, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at the end of my remarks a number of editorials from some of our greatest newspapers commenting on this particular jurisdictional dispute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, at this point I shall read only the names of the newspapers and the titles of the editorials to indicate the amount of political dynamite that would be set off all over this country if the Senate should go along with the House proposal to wreck the Conciliation Service in order to get rid of the entire top staff of that Service.

New York Times, March 31, 1947, The Ax to Conciliation.

St. Louis Post-Dispatch, March 24, 1947, An Ominous Rebellion.

Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky., March 24, 1947, A Feud Is Served in Economy's Name.

Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, Boston, Mass., March 28, 1947, Public Disservice.

Washington Post, March 26, 1947, Abuse of Power.

Washington Post, March 2, 1947, Conciliation Service.

Evening Star, March 22, 1947, Bad Politics.

Christian Science Monitor, March 28, 1947, Saving—and Skulking.

Chicago Sun, March 25, 1947, No Witch Hunt Intended.

Minneapolis Times, Minneapolis, Minn., March 28, 1947, A Devious House Maneuver.

Post-Journal, Jamestown, N. Y., March 19, 1947, Wrong Method.

Miami Daily News, March 19, 1947, Legislation by Fiat.

DIVISION OF LABOR STANDARDS TO BE ABOLISHED

Perhaps the most revealing touch of heavy-handedness on the part of those who drafted and approved this ill-considered measure now before us is the complete abolition of the Division of Labor Standards, after that Division has been in operation for 14 years for the purpose of improving working conditions in industry. In 1913 the Department of Labor was formed to improve the conditions of wage earners. Yet it was not until 1934 that Congress appropriated funds for a separate division of the Department which would be charged with this very function.

And now, after this Division has had a real opportunity to show its ability to cut production costs by improving working conditions, a movement is afoot to abolish it completely. Probably one of the outstanding contributions of the Department of Labor to the war effort has been its national industrial safety and health program. It is common knowledge that far more man-hours of work were lost during the war because of accidents than because of labor disputes or any other single cause. Realizing this, the Department of Labor organized and successfully carried out a militant campaign to prevent accidents in war industries. This was merely a special application of its peacetime facilities for this purpose. Classes in plant safety were held, State inspectors were trained, thousands of plant safety consultations were given, and research on prevention methods was carried out. The result was that the United States was the only industrial nation that reduced accidents in the midst of war.

Mr. President, let me remind the Members of the Senate that it is not only the individual wage earner who suffers from irresponsible action wiping out these activities which are indispensable in peacetime as well as in war. It is industry that suffers, too. And here, again, the cuts the Senate is asked to accept will fall with equal harm upon the employers and workers.

In its safety and health program the Division of Labor Standards is constantly hammering home the principle that accidents cost American management and labor \$3,500,000,000 a year—and that safety devices are money-saving investments. Private accident prevention activities cover only one-third of industry. These private programs do not touch two-thirds of all plants and untold numbers of workers. Here is where the program of the Division of Labor Standards comes in, and where it can really do the job.

The House committee commented that the activities of the Division of Labor Standards should be left to the States. I believe that a similar argument would be equally effective to support the abolition of the entire United States Department of Labor. In fact I am not sure whether the House committee did not

have this thought in mind when recommending the action taken on the appropriation measure for the Department. Certainly the Department will exist barely more than in name only should the Senate follow the recommendations of the House of Representatives.

The thought, the motive which appears to have dictated the liquidation of the Division of Labor Standards is in my opinion the same as that to which the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] alluded when speaking on the USES cuts. He said:

Before the issue is settled I think the truth will out. It seems to me they are determined to break up the national economic unity into 48 different State economies warring with each other for short-range advantage in labor costs and in stagnant pools of surplus idle workers in isolated towns and villages being bought and sold like commodities on the labor markets.

I recognize that the same program for the break-up of our economic unity—for the Balkanization of the United States is planned with respect to other appropriations, if I judge correctly what is coming out of the House appropriations. I propose to stand up and oppose that type of budgetary cut in the Senate of the United States.

The House bill proposes to transfer another function of the Division of Labor Standards—its labor education service—to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Just as the Division's safety service prevents waste from industrial accidents, so its labor education service attempts to prevent costly industrial strife by education. Today when labor-management harmony is perhaps our primary domestic goal, the House curtails funds for this preventive service and transfers it to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. This is a fact-finding agency not equipped to perform this function.

The House action also halves funds for the Division of Labor Standards' child labor and youth employment branch and transfers this function to the Wage and Hour Division. This child labor function was established as part of the Children's Bureau by the action of a Republican Congress and a Republican President back in 1912. When, as an aftermath of war, two and one-half times as many youngsters are at work today as in 1940, this is no time to reduce funds for controlling child labor. This is no time to turn research, advisory, and guidance functions for State labor departments and community agencies, over to an inspection agency which did not seek this responsibility and is not equipped to perform it.

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Mr. President, I should like now to comment on the proposed 25-percent cut in the funds of the Wage and Hour Division and show what I believe to be extremely unfortunate results would result from such a cut, because of the grave weakening of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

When the Wage and Hour Division was organized to enforce the Fair Labor Standards Act, we asked that, if possible, one of the regional offices to be developed should be located in Alabama. We have nothing to fear from close contact with the Wage and Hour Division, and nothing

to hide. On the contrary, the location of a regional office in Birmingham, to advise employers and employees alike as to their duties and rights under the act, has been most helpful. Should the 25-percent cut in funds necessitate the closing of that regional office, as I understand it would, we should feel a loss of much more than the few Federal employees involved in that office. We should feel, and I believe with reason, that the protection of the act to our industries and to our workers would be seriously weakened.

In Alabama, and for the country as a whole, the possible number of inspections under the reduced funds voted by the House would not be much more than half of the number of new establishments with affected employees which spring up each year. For the total of establishments already in existence, the proposed funds would allow inspection of only 5 or 6 percent. These facts, Mr. President, are uncontested.

Mr. President, in the hearings on the 1948 budgets of the various governmental agencies and in the floor discussion in both Houses there has been a great deal of talk of the need to eliminate wartime expenditures and to get back to a peacetime basis, meaning largely a prewar basis. When the facts in a particular situation support this program, I am heartily in favor of this approach, but the facts in the case of the Wage and Hour Division are quite different.

The Wage and Hour Division, year by year since the beginning of World War II, has had to get along with inspecting a smaller number of establishments. The first full year we were at war saw a decrease in the number of plants visited of nearly 20 percent, and each succeeding year saw a further decrease of 10 to 20 percent. When these cuts are added to the proposed 25-percent additional cut proposed by the Republicans in the House, the number of inspected plants will have gone down from 75,000 to 33,000, a cut of substantially more than one-half. And that is not all, Mr. President. Our economy since 1933 has been an expanding economy, and due primarily to that expansion, there are thousands more of new establishments covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act than there were before the war; there are tens of thousands more of existing establishments affected, and millions more of workers. If these additional facts are taken into consideration, the proposed additional cut in the light of the total situation means a cut to one-third of the prewar level of activity.

Mr. President, there is an old saying that there are more ways to kill a cat than by choking it with butter; and there are more ways of killing the Fair Labor Standards Act than by outright repeal. One of these ways is to deny sufficient funds to do an effective job of enforcement. The 25-percent proposed cut would have that effect, although both great parties were committed in their 1944 program to support of that act.

What would be the effect upon employers? The honest, scrupulous employer who plans his work on the basis of complying with fair labor standards will be forced increasingly to reconsider his posi-

tion in the light of the successful evasion of the more unscrupulous, which frequently results in competitive harm to the law abiding. Consequently a wholesale disregard of the requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act would be in the offing. Mr. President, instead of reducing still further the inadequate funds for the Wage and Hour Division, I believe we should give serious consideration to an increase, to the end that the fair labor standards which Congress meant should have general application in specified fields should be more generally observed.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR CUT ONE-THIRD

Similarly the Office of the Solicitor has been cut by one-third and even the office of the Secretary has been crippled. This will, of course, mean a chain reaction to the penny-wise and pound-foolish policy which all of these cuts represent.

With particular regard to the Office of the Solicitor, these cuts would come at a time when litigation under the Wage-Hour Act has reached a peak, and when new interpretations of the act may be essential by reason of portal-to-portal amendments. The House committee explains this action by pointing to reduction in services in the Solicitor's office by reason of the abolition of the Division of Labor Standards, and the end of wartime functions such as retraining and reemployment, wage adjustment, and wage stabilization.

But these wartime functions have already been eliminated. They find no reflection in the appropriation estimates. In fact, the Solicitor's office never has given assistance to the Wage Stabilization Board, which had its own legal staff. Furthermore, I am told that the Division of Labor Standards at no time has required more than the services of one attorney on a part-time basis.

A BLOW AT THE UNITED NATIONS

With the establishment of the United Nations and the coordination of the International Labor Office with its activities, the Department of Labor has been required to assume added responsibilities in the field of international affairs relating to labor and social policy. Yet these activities and their legitimate value were completely ignored by the appropriations measure which the House has requested us to consider. The entire staff devoted to these operations was dismissed as unnecessary. I wonder whether this demonstrates an intention to view the United Nations as unnecessary, as a matter of policy. Certainly the abolition of these functions of the Department of Labor is only one step removed from disapproving all appropriations supporting this country's role as a member of that great international body.

MAY COST BILLIONS TO SAVE \$14,000,000

Mr. President, I have been talking about the preservation of services vital to the welfare of labor, of employers, of consumers, and essential to the maintenance of continued health in our entire economy.

These cuts, which would cost the American people hundreds of millions and perhaps billions of dollars in increases in work stoppages due to inadequate mediation and conciliation ma-

chinery, to lack of up-to-date information on employment, wages, the cost of living and standard provisions in collective-bargaining contracts, total only \$14,000,000. What we would save at the spout would run out at the bung hole. We would be doing disservice to all wage earners, to employers and to the public interest. In my opinion—and I believe many Members on both sides of the aisle will agree—such a “butchery,” to quote the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] would come pretty close to betrayal of the national interest and security. The penalty for that is sure in our democracy.

The Senate has long been known, and justly so, for its fairness and thoroughness in protecting the public welfare, even in times of hysteria and clamor. I know that Senators will give this Labor Department appropriation, which is a leading case, so to speak, blazing the trail for the Eightieth Congress, the careful study it deserves. I hope Senators, without regard to party, will concur in the conclusion that the cuts I have described are foolhardy, wasteful of the national welfare, harmful to management as much as to labor, and therefore totally unjustified.

Because of the intrinsic importance of the services at stake and because these proposed cuts do comprise a leading case, I suggest that Senators give the subject their attention immediately. The Appropriation Subcommittee now holding hearings may thus have benefit of their information and advice while I hope and trust the vital organs of the Labor Department are being restored in the sessions of that committee.

RELATION TO NEW LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. President, in a few days we are to begin the consideration of so-called labor legislation. I understand that some proposals that labor may consider to be unduly restrictive may be recommended by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. It would be unfortunate if, in addition to this recommended new legislation, the wage earners of the Nation were to be told by action of the Senate that the one Department of the Federal Government dedicated to the protection of their welfare had been gutted by flame throwers in the reckless and vengeful hands of those who in the name of so-called economy would destroy that edifice.

I think we will be wise if we make plain to the wage earners that we do not propose vengeful treatment, either in appropriations or substantive legislation, that we are concerned rather with the public interest and with the interest of labor and all other segments of our economy and our people. Because of the imminence of debate on labor legislation it is of extreme importance that we restore the functions which the House has cut out of the Labor Department by the indirect method of budget slashes.

The President has stated that the budget requested for the Labor Department is the rock-bottom minimum and is part of the \$37,000,000,000 national budget, which, it now appears, will make possible a surplus of receipts over expenditures of \$3,000,000,000 in the com-

ing fiscal year. I submit that, considering the critical days ahead in our domestic and international affairs, and the fact that the Labor Department has assisted materially in keeping our economy operating at near capacity, the full amount of the Labor Department budget requested by the President should be appropriated by the Senate and the Congress. Thus the welfare of labor, of employers, and the national interest and security will be protected and promoted.

EXHIBIT A

[From The Saturday Evening Post]

THE BOOK THAT WENT TO WAR—THE OCCUPATIONAL DICTIONARY GUIDED MOBILIZATION OF AMERICA'S GREATEST INDUSTRIAL ARMY

(By Warner Olivier)

Late in 1941 Gene Osmansky, 35, a hosiery knitter, lost his job with thousands of other silk workers as a result of the embargo on Japanese silk. A silk worker since he left high school, Gene could do no other skilled job—or so he thought.

Hopeless of getting another job for a long time, he nevertheless made routine application for work at the local office of the United States Employment Service, at the same time asking for unemployment compensation.

Gene never got his unemployment compensation. Instead, he went to work 2 days later at the semiskilled job of winding coils for a company manufacturing airplane detectors. Employment Service workers consulted a book, poked needles through speed-sort cards, and were able to tell Gene and his fellow silk workers of more than 350 important war jobs they could do, with or without brief training.

What is the answer?

Six years before Pearl Harbor two men in Washington put their heads together to solve one of industry's greatest problems. The dimly foreseen result was the fashioning of what today is probably the most powerful secret weapon in the arsenal of democracy.

It does not prowl the seas or fly to rain death on war-swollen Tokyo. It will not parachute to earth to set up a second front in Europe. But it has sent, and is sending, men to do all those things.

It is a four-volume book with a title which sounds like a professor's dream: The Dictionary of Occupational Titles. It has already influenced the lives of 70 percent of the American people, though few of us have ever heard of it. Without it, our industrial war effort conceivably might have earned the melancholy footnote of history—too little and too late. The book's importance to the future is hardly calculable.

That is saying a great deal. American industry, with all the chips down, can testify it is not saying too much. So can the United States Army and Navy, whose work it has made possible. So can British and Canadian industry and the British army and navy, which have taken it over, part and parcel.

In the most dramatic industrial spectacle in history, the recruitment and disposition of American manpower and womanpower, the dictionary tells who shall man jobs, where, when and how.

When new munitions and ordnance plants began to spring up with life-or-death war contracts awaiting completion, management had to know what kind of skilled workers were needed, how many and where they could be got. Employment Service workers with the dictionary under their arms made plant analyses and job studies in similar plants and arsenals already in operation, and were able to tell the new plants what personnel was needed. They also told them to look to unemployed miners for many of the workers, for miners already have many of the skills, and the psychological adjustment needed by munitions workers.

With its aid, skilled workers long retired or drifted into other fields were recalled to the front lines of industry to do skilled and essential jobs.

Last June, when upward of a million willing-handed boys and girls came out of the high schools, the dictionary helped place them in war industries all over the land.

It has brought new recruits to industry from the ranks of handicapped persons, many of whom were considered unemployable. A legless Detroit man, who sold automobiles as long as there were automobiles to sell, is now employed as a process inspector in a factory because of latent skill brought to light with the aid of the dictionary.

Seven years in the making and not yet completed, the dictionary grew out of the great need for it. There was little or no agreement on job titles. Many employers, for example, thought they knew what a machinist was. But workmen in more than a score of widely different jobs were called “machinists.” A machinist might be a bench hand. He might be a tool operator. To one mine boss a worker was a “screen ape.” To another he was a “grizzly worker.” And so it went.

How could employment agencies supply men for jobs when they did not know what skills were required? For years industrial psychologists, personnel men, and others stormed for definition of occupational titles.

In 1935 William H. Stead, then head of the Occupational Research Division of the United States Employment Service, and Carroll L. Shartle, now Chief of the Occupational Analysis Section, resolved to do something about it and started making the dictionary. Many agencies and hundreds of individuals cooperated.

They went down into the mines, into publishing plants, into all kinds of factories, the theater, stores, offices, hospitals, local governments, schools, and churches, and they came out with detailed descriptions of every job performed.

They defined jobs and skills ranging from janitor to judge, from clergyman to striptease artist, from cost accountant to minstrel, and from screen actor to caterpillar-crane operator.

Volume I and its supplement of the dictionary define 19,000 different job classifications and list 33,000 titles, since many of the same jobs are known by different names.

Code numbers were assigned to each job up to six digits. The first digit represents a general classification: Zero for professional and managerial occupations, 1 for clerical workers, 2 for service workers, 3 for agricultural, forestry, and fishery workers, 4 and 5 for skilled industrial occupations, 6 and 7 for semiskilled and 8 and 9 for unskilled. Subsequent digits define the particular skill and job.

For example 4-93-371 in the dictionary stands for a lock assembler III. The 4 means he is skilled. The next two digits, 93, mean he is a metalworker. The 371 identifies his specific job, which is to fasten together component parts of locks, using screws, bolts, and rivets. A lock assembler I is a common laborer in automobile manufacture and a lock assembler II is a furniture worker.

Volume II lists the code numbers of the jobs. Volume III is merely a translation of old codes into the new universal code. Volume IV is the entry classification volume and is designed to help classify the inexperienced worker—Bill Jones and Mary Smith, just getting out of high school or college. It is used in conjunction with aptitude tests, interviews, and other tried methods of matching personalities, temperaments, and potential skills to jobs.

Compiling the dictionary disclosed a simple fact of startling and far-reaching implications—that jobs run in families. Most

jobs probably have more cousins than you have and the blood tie is close.

This discovery paved the way for the development of a revolutionary employment technique—the job-family study—used to find workers for jobs requiring rare skills which make them difficult to fill.

A job-family study cuts across industrial lines to pick up related jobs in other industries.

The Baldwin Locomotive Works, now manufacturing tanks, needed metal lathe operators, which were not available. A job-family study showed that in the wholly different field of stone work stone lathe operators had a skill almost identical with that of metal lathe operators.

When a War Production Board order halted manufacture of radios, an eastern radio plant, converting itself into a war industry, had no further use for 1,000 skilled woodworkers in its cabinet department. The United States Employment Service made a plant-job study and learned the 1,000 workers did 98 different jobs. By related occupations, they found that 300 of the workers were qualified to work in other capacities in the plant by a slight adaptation of their skills. Another 370 were found to be doing work closely related to machine-tool occupations and, after brief training, they took over machine-tool jobs. The remainder had skills useful in shipbuilding and leather manufacture and were soon at work in these essential war industries.

The job-family study has been, industrially, a magna carta for women. To marshal all available manpower of the Nation, the Employment Service made a check to determine what industrial jobs had been or were being done by women and fanned these out in a job study. The result was the publication of a booklet listing nearly 2,000 war jobs and hundreds of nonwar jobs suitable for women.

The day of publication of the booklet, the Employment Service was swamped with requests for copies from personnel managers all over the country. The result has been a sharp upswing in the number of women placed in industrial jobs.

The Occupational Dictionary and Job Analysis have opened wide fields for handicapped and disabled workers.

Fred W., 38, blind from birth, married and the father of two children, was considered unemployable. He eked out a living for his family by playing a saxophone on the streets of New York and soliciting alms. His country went to war and he wanted to do something. Was there anything he could do, he asked the local United States Employment Service office.

He was tested and found to have, as many blind persons do have, great sensitivity in his fingers. A former washing-machine factory, now making machine guns, had sent out a call for men to check ballbearings and ball races to see if they were even. A job analysis showed that a good tactile sense rather than sight was necessary to do the work. Fred W. was given the job and subsequently other blind men filled similar jobs with the company.

Job-family studies resulted in the listing of machine feeding or tending operations suitable for totally blind persons. Similar studies resulted in the listing of fifty-odd occupations of the arc-welding family which could be performed by individuals having only one hand, if an artificial contrivance were used in place of the missing hand.

The philosophy governing placement of handicapped workers is: It is not what a man has lost, but what he has left, that counts.

A Hartford automobile-wrecking company needed a torch worker to cut up cars and stack the parts. The Employment Service had on file applications from an experienced torch man with a paralyzed arm and a man with only one eye. It added their skill and strength together and placed the two as a

team to fill the job. Since together they could do far more work than a single man, their salaries were satisfactorily adjusted.

Because of the dictionary and job-family studies, some companies have found they can use handicapped workers even better than normal workers. The deaf, it was discovered, make the best comptometer operators because they are not distracted by noise.

Because of the broadened horizons of useful employment the dictionary has opened to all kinds of workers, it is expected to provide a cushion against widespread unemployment in the reconstruction years of peace which lie ahead. Probably few workers of the future will be employed without reference to it. For in its four maroon-bound volumes are the plans and blueprints of all the arts and skills that man has so far mastered on the long road from his uttermost yesterday to the tomorrow of his dreams.

EXHIBIT B

[From the New York Times, March 31, 1947]

THE AX TO CONCILIATION

Among the several follies committed by the House of Representatives in the pursuit of economy, chopping down the Conciliation Service in the Labor Department is one that calls for correction when the Senate takes up that supply bill. Edgar L. Warren, chief of the Conciliation Service, was the unhappy target of this ax swinging. It seems that some 10 years ago Mr. Warren, who has been with the Government since 1938, was a member of the American League for Peace and Democracy and the Washington Book Shop, a cooperative. These organizations were later described in some quarters as Communist fronts. Mr. Warren says that he has not been a member of either organization since 1939. In 1945 Mr. Warren said that "on a theoretical basis he saw no reason why Government employees should not have the right to strike." We do not agree with this position at all, Mr. Warren, a few months after he took it, corrected his attitude by saying: "I should like to have the record clearly show that I am opposed to strikes of Government employees."

So it is plain that Mr. Warren, like most of us, has made some mistakes. The record does not show many. Since 1945 he has been chief of the Conciliation Service, which attempts to settle disputes between labor and industry and, when they get that far, strikes. In trying, with considerable success, to improve and vitalize this agency he has apparently trod on the toes of some Members of Congress. He has brought in some bright young men, we are told, and some of these—no matter how able they were at conciliation—perhaps have not had the preliminary intialing of political patrons. This, we submit, is in Mr. Warren's favor. But the main question, in congressional action, is not what happens to Mr. Warren, himself, but to the Conciliation Service. The cut made by the House would not only eliminate his position but also those of 100 other officials and employees. It is an action that would wreck the service which has played a part in averting recent utilities strikes, has reported in a single month its settlement of 304 strikes involving 318,000 workers, and in 3 days alone last fall effected settlements in 20 strikes, all of which had lasted 30 days or more.

We believe that such an agency as the Conciliation Service is a beneficial influence in avoiding and reducing the damaging effects of strikes, and that Mr. Warren has worked hard and earnestly to improve that service under difficult circumstances. This view is confirmed in the tribute paid to Mr. Warren's leadership by representatives of both unions and industry. Mr. Warren is a loyal and patriotic American, in the opinion of the Labor-Management Advisory Committee of the Conciliation Service and has conscientiously discharged the duties of his office.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 24, 1947]

AN OMINOUS REBELLION

An attempt has broken out in the House of Representatives to dictate whom President Truman can hire and fire by withholding salary funds. So far, the Appropriations Committee has cut off Edgar L. Warren, Director of the Conciliation Service, on charges of leftist leanings. But if the anti-Warren maneuver succeeds, the House may go on to bigger game. Thus, Southern Demagog Eugene Cox says that if the Senate confirms David E. Lillenthal to the Atomic Energy Commission, he favors refusing funds to pay him. For reasons that the Warren case brings out, this development is ominous in the extreme.

First, effective government is simply impossible if Congress sets itself up as personnel director to the executive branch. The attempt to do so is profoundly in contempt of the Constitution. Secretary Schwelmbach is right: "It is not the function of Congress to tell me who to hire or to fire."

Second, personnel dictation by Congress is in effect burning down a house to exterminate a suspicion of moths in the coat closet. The Conciliation Service is a useful agency that cuts down the frequency and severity of strikes. No bureau can operate well without a responsible head.

Third, the committee has convicted a man without fair trial or pretense of hearing in his own defense. It accuses Warren of once belonging to Communist-front groups—and uses an un-American way to oust him.

The committee's own offenses must be cleaned up before Warren can possibly be appraised on the merits. It has made charges which the Secretary of Labor and the President should sift. If their verdict does not satisfy the accusers, the case could then be taken up by the House Labor Committee. The committee could not fire Warren, but if its examination reflected seriously on his fitness, public opinion would force his superiors to do so.

Instead, the Appropriations Committee tars him and cuts off his pay. Its act is all the uglier because the committee had to use a legalistic loophole to do it. When Robert Morss Lovett, Goodwin B. Watson, and William E. Dodd, Jr., were ousted on similar charges, the Supreme Court ruled that singling out executive employees by name for punishment is a forbidden bill of attainder. Taking profit from that experience, a committee now undertakes to fire a man by abolishing his job—which, for all moral purposes and practical effect, is the same thing.

The maneuver smells, and will smell worse if it proceeds further with Warren or to other executive officials. If the majority leadership in Congress is alert to the GOP's own interest it will be stopped and set aside right now.

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of March 24, 1947]

A FEUD IS SERVED IN ECONOMY'S NAME

There are Members of Congress who apparently have learned nothing from the Supreme Court's rebuke for misuse of their appropriating power. They have veered close to the old offense in their latest witch hunt in the Department of Labor, proposing virtually to wreck the Conciliation Service because they don't like its director, Edgar L. Warren.

Two years or so ago Congress took its money club in hand and knocked three New Deal veterans, Messrs. Lovett, Watson, and Dodd, out of office. On the ground that the three were associated with alleged leftist organizations, a special provision severed them from the pay roll. Months afterward the Court held that this constituted a bill of attainder, or condemnation of individuals by legislative

action. It was expressly forbidden by the Bill of Rights.

Now the House Appropriations Committee votes to withdraw appropriation for the office of the Director of the Conciliation Service. Director Warren, it hears from a subcommittee, once belonged to a couple of suspicious societies. Once he made a speech suggesting the right of public employees to strike.

It doesn't matter that he has abjured the membership and changed his mind about the right to strike. It doesn't matter that the most substantial of testimony, coming from distinguished former members of the War Labor Board, says he is loyal, able, and fair. He must go. The committee proposes incorrigibly to move into the administrative field to put him out. He must go because of who he is and, we suspect, because he really is what his former colleagues say he is—able and fair as a conciliator and settler of labor-management disputes.

Two details of the occurrence are noteworthy. One is the committee's straight-faced acceptance of the dubious Committee on Un-American Activities as a certifying agent of national organizations. Another is the failure of the Appropriation Committee to make more than a token cut in the President's estimate for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency—and to make this partly not on grounds of economy but of personal undesirability.

Incidentally, the President's budget, which the opposition has voted to cut by \$4,500,000,000 to \$6,000,000,000, is holding up well. Only about 5 percent has been taken out of departmental requests so far, and at this rate it begins to appear that slashing expenses in these uncertain times is not as easy as talking about it for the political record. And at that, as one sees, it wasn't economy which figured in the Conciliation Service's trimming.

[From the Providence Journal and Evening Bulletin, Boston, Mass., of March 28, 1947]

PUBLIC DISSERVICE

A year ago last November one of the few points on which Mr. Truman's labor-management conference agreed was that the United States Conciliation Service should be strengthened. The Nation was then heading, as it still is, into industrial controversies whose amicable solution is essential to continuity of production in a critical period. The importance of the role that the Conciliation Service plays in such circumstances can hardly be exaggerated.

Even in the disastrous strike year of 1946 the Conciliation Service was instrumental in preventing many more strikes than those that actually occurred. But its successful preventive work naturally did not capture the headlines. This year, with labor in a more conciliatory frame of mind even though it is asking for higher wage agreements, the Conciliation Service ordinarily would face a better opportunity to adjust industrial disputes before they result in costly strikes.

But the House has already acted to impair rather than strengthen the Conciliation Service. Some disgruntled Republicans, led by Mr. KEEFE of Wisconsin, persuaded the Appropriations Committee, and subsequently the whole House, to cut off the salary of Mr. Warren, Director of the Conciliation Service. This attempted indirect removal of a competent and distinguished head is a clear public disservice. Its effect is to demoralize and weaken a vital service in a crucial period.

This public disservice has been compounded by a substantial reduction in the appropriation for the Conciliation Service in the next fiscal year. It raises again the question of how intelligently the Republican effort to economize, laudable in its over-all objective, is being directed.

It represents a poor response by Congress to the recommendation of the President's

labor-management conference that "Congress should immediately make available funds for improving and strengthening the service." It flies in the face of a recent recommendation of the Committee for Economic Development which suggests that the Conciliation Service "be staffed by persons of high professional competence and given funds sufficient to permit it to deal effectively with the responsibilities assigned to it."

Republican leaders in Congress should take sober second thought about this vitally important matter, both as to Mr. Warren and the whole appropriation, and correct the situation before it is too late. The Nation cannot afford to pay off political grudges of Members of Congress by economizing in places where the ultimate results are so exceedingly costly.

[From the Washington Post of March 26, 1947]

ABUSE OF POWER

No alien agent could devise a doctrine more pernicious or more subversive of American political principles than the proposal now being put forward by certain Members of Congress that the appropriation power be used to rule the personnel policies of the executive branch of the Government. If this proposal is permitted to prevail, Congress will have annulled the separation of powers which the framers of the Constitution deemed essential to the maintenance of American freedom. The legislature, designed to serve as one of the three coordinate elements of a system delicately balanced to forbid tyranny, will have assumed absolute control through a coup d'etat. The result will be a form of dictatorship—no less dictatorial and no less alien to American traditions if exercised by a group of men than if exercised by one man alone.

If Congress can use its appropriation power to oust, say, the Director of the Conciliation Service, then it could do the same, if it chose, to the Secretary of Labor or even to the President of the United States. And if the Supreme Court interposed a judicial prohibition, Congress might sweep it aside by the same device of withholding the funds requisite to its support. That the power to do this is inherent in the appropriation power does not make the use of it any less evil and despotic. Each element of the tripartite American Government is expected to employ its power with restraint and in conformity with the spirit animating the Constitution. Our political system can survive only as this spirit is respected.

There is a lesser, yet by no means negligible danger entailed in the projected congressional usurpation of the executive power to hire and to fire. It tends to make Federal employment intolerable for all but the most docile, insipid, uninspired, and conventional men and women. Any individual whose mind transcends the bounds of narrow political orthodoxy stands liable to dismissal on the ruinous charge of disloyalty to his country. The procedures for loyalty investigation established by the President at least afford opportunity for review of charges by impartial boards. But what is proposed now is that Congress itself act at once as prosecutor and as jury, proscribing and stigmatizing Federal employees in accordance with the ideological whim of a transient majority.

Representative Cox has carried this concept to its ultimate absurdity by proposing that David E. Lillenthal, even if confirmed by the Senate after the most exhaustive inquiry into his character and qualifications, be denied office through a denial of funds to his vital agency. Thus the constitutional authority of the President to nominate and of the Senate to confirm could be set aside by a mere majority in the House. Government service, subject to such hazards, would

scarcely seem alluring to men of originality and initiative. This is a formula for restricting public office to the second rate.

[From the Washington Post of April 2, 1947]

CONCILIATION SERVICE

Under leadership of Representative FRANK KEEFE, the House of Representatives has blandly employed its appropriation power to wreck the Federal Conciliation Service. Mr. KEEFE dislikes Edgar Warren, Director of the Service, and is not above employing his congressional immunity to call him names of which the libel laws would otherwise make him chary. Unhappily, his intemperate ill will does injury not only to Mr. Warren but to the whole country which needs the good offices of the Conciliation Service in resolving labor-management disputes. The need has never been greater than at the present time.

The President's Labor-Management Conference of November 1945, unanimously recommended that Congress should immediately make available funds for improving and strengthening the (Conciliation) Service. Nearly every student of industrial relations has made a similar recommendation. It was to effect this improvement that Mr. Warren was appointed, with a labor-management advisory committee to aid him. This advisory committee has now made a public declaration that Mr. Warren "has conscientiously discharged the duties of his office," that "substantial progress" has been made in the last year under his direction and, finally, that "all who have been associated with Mr. Warren regard him as a loyal and patriotic American."

No doubt there is room for legitimate difference of opinion about the wisdom of some of the reforms he has effected. But it is indisputable that reform was necessary, and the director of an agency is entitled to exercise a reasonable degree of discretion in the course of a reorganization. There has been indorsement of Mr. Warren's judgment and conduct from important management, and labor sources alike—a significant indication that he has dealt with both impartially. The importance of the Conciliation Service has been vigorously attested by both and in addition by men who have had long experience as representatives of the public in labor-management mediation and arbitration. Several of them subscribed their names to a letter to this effect in the Post last Thursday. We hope that the Senate will amend the recklessness of the House and restore the effectiveness of the Conciliation Service.

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 22, 1947]

BAD POLITICS

The House Appropriations Committee has some color of reason to go after the scalp of Edgar L. Warren, Director of the Federal Conciliation Service.

The case against Mr. Warren is far from being a conclusive one. Some years ago he joined two Communist-front organizations, but, according to his testimony, withdrew when he discovered their true character. It is also established that in 1945 he expressed a belief in the theoretical right of Government workers to strike, although he now says that he has changed his mind about this. On the other side of the ledger are the facts that he has done a creditable job as head of the conciliation service and that he enjoys the confidence of many business leaders.

On the whole record, however, it would be difficult to say that Congress would be wholly unjustified in coming to the conclusion that Mr. Warren is the wrong man for the job he holds. But that is an entirely different thing from saying that the Appropriations Committee is justified in the action it has taken.

The committee has not been content merely to lock the door on Mr. Warren. Instead, through an abuse of its control of the purse, it has assumed a veto power over the filling of Mr. Warren's post and the posts of about 100 other executives and employees of the conciliation service. The effect of this is to wreck the service by withholding essential appropriations.

Similar action was taken with respect to the National Labor Relations Board. Some members of the committee wanted to abolish the NLRB outright. Others, presumably conscious of the absurdity of this while the Wagner Act remains on the statute books, insisted on a compromise. So the result is that an already understaffed agency finds its recommended appropriation cut in half, and is faced with the prospect of being held responsible for a task for which the committee will not provide the necessary funds.

This sort of thing is not only bad government; it is also bad politics, as the Republican legislators may discover to their sorrow.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of
March 28, 1947]

SAVING—AND SKULKING

The economy forces in Congress are showing the courage of their convictions. Under Republican leadership, the House has just trimmed \$77,825,320 from a \$1,500,000,000 supply bill. To do so, it has in several cases cut where it hurt. It has separated a lot of people from the Federal pay roll. It has dropped services which many citizens consider vital.

For instance, it has practically halved the appropriation for the National Labor Relations Board, more than halved the funds asked for the Bureau of Labor Statistics. And it has cut the Labor Department's Conciliation Service in a way to force out of office the head of that agency, Edgar L. Warren, and 100 of his aides.

In this last action the House forgot economy and took a slippery and dangerous step in the direction of intimidating officials. This was not a decision that no director of the Conciliation Service is needed. If the House had frankly abolished the office the action could have been judged squarely on the basis of economy or wisdom. But that was not the idea. The House was aiming at Mr. Warren personally.

The House may believe that Mr. Warren is a Communist sympathizer. We don't think the evidence supports any such belief. But if that was the complaint, then the charge should have been formally lodged and adjudicated. If not satisfied with the usual machinery, Congress can always resort to impeachment. The method it did use is in everything but name a bill of attainder—a historic form of injustice barred by the Constitution.

By this procedure Congress might withhold a judge's salary because it didn't like his decisions—or a President's pay if it didn't like his politics. The method would soon destroy the Constitutional division of powers.

The courage of the House in saving should be commended. The wisdom of its saving should be debated. But this punishment of persons by legislative action is not saving. It is skulking behind the pretense of saving. It can only be condemned—and stopped.

[From the Chicago Sun of March 25, 1947]
NO WITCH HUNT INTENDED

President Truman's order for extensive loyalty tests of Government employees will not be a witch hunt, says a White House official, but it is clear that the makings of one exist. The new rules for determining loyalty are so broad and flexible that they can be stretched to cover all sorts of intellectual activity which a narrow-minded administrator might construe as "subversive."

The Attorney General, for example, is given blanket power to decide whether an organization is subversive; then not only its members but anybody guilty of "sympathetic association" with it become subject to the brand of disloyalty.

So a great deal of energy and a great deal of money will be spent in ferreting out Reds, real or suspected. Congress cannot bring itself to spend \$25,000,000 to keep the school-lunch program going, but it will no doubt appropriate ten or fifteen million dollars for the Red hunt without turning a hair.

That disloyal persons have no place in Government employ goes without saying. That Government personnel must be scrutinized closely for evidence of disloyalty is equally obvious. But a hare-and-hounds pursuit of every minor clerk who ever handed out literature at the meetings of an alleged Communist-front organization is something else altogether. Not only will this sort of witch hunt prove a waste of time and money, in that it won't turn up enough significant disloyalty to matter. Perhaps the most serious result will be the inquisitorial atmosphere created among Government employees and the public.

A good example of what may be expected is the House Appropriations Committee's decision to withhold the salary of Edgar L. Warren, chief conciliator of the Department of Labor, one of the best industrial-relations men in Government service. Mr. Warren's loyalty was attested by five former members of the War Labor Board, and can be backed up by anybody else who knows him. But his scalp was demanded because he had once been a member of two insignificant organizations which the former Dies committee thinks were led by Communists.

Men of Mr. Warren's ability can get profitable private employment any time they want it. Certainly they are going to fight shy of public service under the conditions of intellectual tyranny now being created.

President Truman's loyalty commission pointed to the Canadian espionage expose as evidence that a threat to our system of government exists. In Canada a number of Government employees were induced, by their sympathy with communism, to reveal official secrets. For their betrayal no apologies can be made. But it is neither startling nor new to learn that where some men will betray their country for money others will betray it for ideas. The same charge could have been brought by England against the founders of the United States of America.

Are we wise, instead of concentrating attention on disloyalty itself, to preoccupy ourselves with one potential motive for disloyalty? If our Government hopes to stamp out any ideas which might lead to disloyalty it had better conduct a simultaneous crusade against the love of money, jealousy, ambition, fear, and envy—all of which may incite treason as well as communism.

The real threat to our system of government does not come from a few misguided erratics who may be induced to disloyalty by their sympathy with certain political and economic ideas. The real threat, if one ever develops, will come from our system's failure to deliver the welfare and the freedom which the people cherish.

[From the Minneapolis Times of March 28, 1947]

A DEVIOUS HOUSE MANEUVER

The Appropriations Committee of the lower House of Congress recently voted to cut the Director of the Conciliation Service from the Federal pay rolls. The Director of that service is Edgar L. Warren, and the action against him flowed from charges that he had once belonged to certain Communist-front organizations. The House as a whole has now concurred in the committee's decision. It has agreed to withhold the funds required to pay Mr. Warren's salary.

There appears to be more than a little danger in this sort of legislative whimsy. Thus it should be noted that the Conciliation Director was separated from the pay roll on charges of the most serious nature without any semblance of a formal hearing at which he might defend himself. It was simply assumed that the allegations made were true, and the lower House set itself up, in this instance, as an arbiter of personnel, and the supreme judge of an employee's fitness.

Whether Mr. Warren is as pink or red as he is painted we do not know. But we are fairly certain that the lower House has no business firing him on mere suspicion, and by such a circuitous device as an appropriations cut.

Economy for the sake of economy is a wholly admirable end. But economy which seeks to impose punishment without a fair trial, and to usurp an executive function, is only a transparent fraud.

If the Warren precedent were to be widely followed, then Congress could ultimately dictate every detail of administrative personnel by the simple expedient of granting or withholding salary funds.

Already Representative Cox of Georgia sees the point. He suggests that the lower House refuse to pay David Lillenthal's salary as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission in the event the Senate confirms his nomination.

For all we know, Mr. Warren is wholly unfit for his conciliation job by reason of his personal philosophies and deserves a prompt retirement to private life.

But the facts should be established at impartial hearings, and full opportunity should be given him to testify on his own behalf.

The business of firing a man on suspicion through such a devious appropriations dodge is difficult to square either with the American system of government or the American concept of fair play. The less we have of it, the better.

[From the Jamestown (N. Y.) Post-Journal
of March 19, 1947]

WRONG METHOD

A House Appropriations subcommittee, headed by Representative KEEFE, Wisconsin Republican, has gone after the scalp of Edgar L. Warren, chief of the Conciliation Service, a bureau of the Department of Labor. It is reported that the subcommittee will attempt to deprive Warren of his job by withholding funds for his salary and the salaries of 11 other top-flight administrators.

Reasons for the subcommittee's desire to add Warren to the army of unemployed Government officials are not clear although his views concerning the right of Government employees to strike are said to be involved. Also mentioned in connection with the move are reports that Warren has not been too cooperative in seeing that friends of some Members of Congress retained their jobs when budget restrictions caused reduction in Conciliation Service personnel. Keefe refers to "good and sufficient reasons which will become apparent at the proper time."

Regardless of what those reasons may be, it seems that the subcommittee is using the wrong methods in its attempts to get rid of a public servant. Precedent favors the method and possibly there are cases where the Congress can make its wishes known in no other way. If that is the case, then there is something wrong with the whole system of judging the fitness of public servants.

If Congress, or a committee of that body, withholds appropriations for salaries for a specific bureau, it should be assumed that the bureau has outlived its usefulness and should be liquidated. If the bureau or a job in the bureau is essential and desirable, then the appropriations should be made and other methods used to get rid of an undesirable appointee. The Congressmen who are op-

posed to Warren should be required to prove in open hearing that he is not fit to hold the position and should not be permitted to force his removal by chopping off his pay and without proving their case. The decisions on appropriations for any Government service should be made only in the light of value to the public.

[From the Miami Daily News of March 19, 1947]

LEGISLATION BY FIAT

At the core of President Truman's proposals for labor legislation last January was the strengthening of the Government's conciliation services for the settlement of disputes before they reached the strike stage. That proposal fell on deaf ears insofar as the Republican Congressmen were concerned.

Now, according to Washington reports, the Conciliation Service already functioning in the Labor Department will be crippled by withholding its funds, another example of the second way to skin a cat which the Republican leaders have hit upon since they obtained control of congressional committees.

Representative FRANK KEEFE, of Wisconsin, who heads the House Appropriations subcommittee in charge of Labor Department funds, does not conceal the fiat legislation he is preparing. "I have said this before," he told a reporter at the Capitol, "and I will say it again: I intend to do everything I can to see that Edgar L. Warren does not continue as head of the Conciliation Service." Having been rebuffed, presumably, in his request to Secretary Schwelienbach for Warren's removal, Representative KEEFE will recommend withholding funds to pay the salaries of Director Warren and at least 11 of his assistants.

Congress was sat upon by the Supreme Court when it attached a rider to an appropriations bill specifically withholding the salaries of Goodwin Watson, Robert M. Lovett, and William E. Dodd in 1943. Representative KEEFE might keep his act constitutional if Warren and his aides were not named in a bill cutting the funds of the Conciliation Service. But constitutional or not, such an act is fiat legislation usurping the right of the executive department to name its own officers.

There are legal ways by which the Congress can abolish the Labor Department's Conciliation Service. There are not enough votes in Congress to do so, and Representative KEEFE's proposal is a subterfuge designed to accomplish the end without a roll call of the majority.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY—AMENDMENT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that, in connection with Senate bill 938, the bill to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, in the committee amendment on page 7 there was a technical error in the language as the result of which the purpose of the amendment is somewhat nullified. I shall move when the times comes to strike out on page 7, line 21, the words "the President is officially notified by the United Nations that," and to strike out the word "that," in line 24, on page 7, so that paragraph (2) of section 5 in the amendment will read:

If the Security Council finds (with respect to which finding the United States waives the exercise of the veto) or the General Assembly finds that action taken or assistance furnished by the United Nations makes the continuance of such assistance unnecessary or undesirable; and.

I may add, Mr. President, that this amendment has the approval of the State Department and makes immutably clear the original purpose of the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Would the Senator from Michigan entertain the suggestion that he have the proposed amendment, which he intends to offer printed for the benefit of other Senators?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment as stated by me be printed and lie upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CAIN in the chair). Without objection, the amendment proposed to be offered by the Senator from Michigan will be printed and lie on the table.

SUPPORT FOR WOOL—CONTINUATION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 814) to provide support for wool, to continue Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the first committee amendment, on page 2, at the beginning of line 9, to insert the word "and".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 10, after the word "wool" to strike out "; and may make discounts from support prices for the purposes of discouraging unsound marketing practices."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 11, after the word "wool" to insert "The disposition of any accumulated stock under the provisions of this section, however, shall be made at such rate and in such manner as will avoid disruption of the domestic market."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on page 3, after line 14, to strike out:

Sec. 6. The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 7 of the act approved January 31, 1935 (49 Stat. 4), as amended, is amended by striking out "June 30, 1947" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1949".

Sec. 7. Section 4 of the act approved March 8, 1938 (52 Stat. 108), as amended, is amended by inserting after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "Not less than \$130,000,000 of the amount borrowed on such obligations shall be made available to support, as required by law, the price of wool produced in the calendar years 1947 and 1948."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, line 3, to change the section number from "8" to "6."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, Senate bill 814 is a simple, straightforward bill. It seeks to give the Commodity Credit Corporation power to continue to purchase the domestic wool clip as it has done for the past 4 years. It also gives the Commodity Credit Cor-

poration authority to dispose of the stock pile of domestic wool which has accumulated during the past 2 or 3 years, and which amounts to approximately 450,000,000 pounds. It gives it authority to sell the wool below parity in competition with foreign imported wool, but in such manner as is provided in the third committee amendment, which reads as follows:

The disposition of any accumulated stock under the provisions of this section, however, shall be made at such rate and in such manner as will avoid disruption of the domestic market.

Mr. President, it seems to me that there are three major commodities, each a critical material, of which we do not raise sufficient for our own consumption and which call for treatment somewhat different from that accorded to the majority of commodities which we raise. Those three commodities are sugar, wool, and rubber. The sugar bill which was passed very recently and which has been approved by the President seems to have taken care of the sugar situation, at least for the time being. But wool is probably different from all other commodities in the production of which labor becomes an important part.

As I stated earlier in the debate on this bill, while during the war period the average rise in prices in the production of various commodities was from 60 to 65 percent, the wages paid in the sheep-producing industry are from 150 to 250 percent in excess of what they were when the war started.

I can give several illustrations of that statement. For instance, prior to the war, a shepherd, a very important wage earner in the business of producing sheep, received approximately \$50 a month and his board. Today he is being paid \$150 a month and his board. A year or 2 years ago that man's wages were as high as \$200 a month. Today, as I say, they are \$150 a month plus board. Various farm hands who raise the feed which is necessary, for those who are in the sheep business to have during the winter months when the range is not available to them, used to be paid \$40 to \$50 a month, and during haying time probably \$2 a day. During 1946 and at present in 1947 those men have been receiving \$4, \$5, or \$6 a day, and in many cases stackers have received as much as \$7 or \$8 a day.

From this it will be seen that the producer is still operating on what are definitely war terms. As a result of this situation the sheep population of the United States has dropped very materially. In 1942 there were approximately 49,000,000 breeding ewes in the United States. The number has dropped in 1947 to 32,500,000. Wool production in 1942 was approximately 455,000,000 grease pounds, and today the estimated total for 1947 is approximately 310,000,000 pounds. That drop is continuing, as will be seen from the fact that in 1946 the number of sheep in the United States dropped 4,000,000 head as compared with 1945, and the estimated drop from 1946 to 1947 is more than 3,000,000 head, and there is every indication that the drop will continue next year.

It would perhaps be well to give a few figures showing the total shorn-wool production in the United States for the years 1943, 1944, and 1945, as they will indicate better than any words of mine how the decline in wool production has been progressive from year to year.

According to the Agricultural Statistics of 1946, issued by the United States Department of Agriculture, pages 352 and 353, the average shorn-wool production from 1934 to 1943 was 370,000,000 pounds. In 1944 it was down to 347,000,000 pounds; in 1945 down to 321,000,000 pounds.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or would he prefer not to be interrupted?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield for a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask a question. The distinguished Senator shows that the production of wool is down. Is it not equally true that in the past few years, when the production of wool was dropping, the production of meat was going up? In other words, the price of meat was high, and lambs and sheep were being sold for meat rather than being kept for wool.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. No; that is not true, Mr. President, in general. What probably caused the increase in price of lambs was their scarcity, because as the number of sheep decreased, so would the number of lambs produced, particularly because breeding ewes are the only kind of sheep kept over from year to year. So when the number of breeding ewes in the United States dropped from 49,000,000 to 32,000,000 there was a great decline in the number of lambs produced and, consequently, the price of lambs increased. Some producers were encouraged to sell their ewe lambs because of the high price which was being paid in general for lambs.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The upward swing in the price of lamb is not peculiar to lamb alone; it applies to all meat.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. It certainly does. I wish to point out that the particular reason it was so effective with regard to lambs was because of the shortage of them. In the case of beef it was because of restrictions.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to make this comment in view of the question asked by the Senator from Massachusetts. From his question the Senator from Massachusetts seems to be under the impression that wool growers were sacrificing their wool in order to sell their animals for meat. The fact of the matter is—and I am sure my colleague will concur in the statement—that the domestic sheep population has been declining because of the instability of the business as a whole including the growing of wool and the growing of lambs for meat. The Senator is mistaken if he has the impression that the production

of wool would have been greater had the price of lambs been lower.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with my colleague in what he says on that question.

Mr. President, in order that the Record may show the situation clearly, I should like to inform the Senate in regard to the production of wool in the various groups of States in 1945. In the North Atlantic States, consisting of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, the total production of shorn wool was 4,282,000 pounds. In the East North Central States, consisting of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin, the production of shorn wool was 28,220,000 pounds. The outstanding wool-producing State in that area was Ohio, which produced 11,956,000 pounds of the total amount of 28,000,000 pounds.

In the West North Central States, consisting of Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas, the total shorn wool production in 1945 was 49,359,000 pounds—North Dakota being the outstanding State, with a production of 11,087,000 pounds.

In those three areas the total amount was 81,861,000 pounds.

In the South Atlantic States, consisting of Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida, the total wool production was 3,862,000 pounds, with West Virginia and Virginia producing 1,668,000 pounds and 1,535,000 pounds, respectively.

Now we come to the more prolific producers of wool. In the south central section, consisting of the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas, in 1945 there was a total shorn wool production of 88,516,000 pounds, of which the great State of Texas alone produced 79,151,000 pounds.

In the Western States, consisting of Montana, Idaho, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, Nevada, Washington, Oregon, and California, in 1945 there was a total shorn wool production of 146,773,000 pounds. The outstanding States for wool production in that area were Wyoming, with 25,631,000 pounds; Montana, with 23,958,000 pounds; and California, with 20,408,000 pounds. I cite those figures in order to show how great is the production of wool in the West.

Mr. President, some objection to this bill comes from the Senators from Massachusetts, really on behalf of the wool dealers in Boston. Boston is the headquarters for the wool dealers of the United States. While a considerable amount of wool is dealt with in Chicago, St. Louis, and Philadelphia, nevertheless the big central market for wool is Boston. Prior to the war our wool consumption was approximately 600,000,000 pounds. Of that amount, in our domestic clip we raised 450,000,000 pounds, and we imported approximately 150,000,000 pounds. Actually, in 1932, of our total consumption that year, only 5 percent was im-

ported wool; whereas in 1946, 80 percent of our total consumption of wool was imported, and a great majority of it was from the United Kingdom, which sends its Australian and New Zealand and South African wool to our shores to compete with our own wool industry.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to invite attention to the fact that the wool dealers and the textile manufacturers in the wool field in 1946 did over 40 percent more business than they have ever done in any peacetime year, and 15 percent more than in the highest year of the war and that their profits are unprecedented and the prospects for several years to come are exceedingly bright, whereas the wool growers' position in the United States has steadily declined, as the distinguished Senator has pointed out.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The Senator is absolutely correct. I should like to make it perfectly plain that the American wool grower is not fighting the dealers in Boston in this matter, but is fighting the British Empire combined.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Wyoming point out what the wool industry means to the Mountain States. For instance, what percentage of the total income of Wyoming is derived from wool?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I cannot state the exact percentage, but it is the major industry in Wyoming.

Mr. YOUNG. Then an increase in the importation of wool would wreck the economy of those States.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. It would wreck the economy of the States to which I referred a moment ago.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As a Senator from Massachusetts I would say—and I am confident that I speak for my colleague—that we have no desire in the world to hurt the wool industry of the Western States or of any portion of the United States. We wish to keep the domestic wool business just as large as we can. We wish to buy domestic wool; we wish to make it possible for those who live in Massachusetts to buy domestic wool, and that is why we are interested in this subject.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I am satisfied of that; but at the same time—

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. In view of the statistics which the Senator has given in regard to the decrease in the production of wool in the various Western States, is it not a fact that the wool industry in those States will be practically out of business if the decline continues?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I wish to point out to the Senator from South Dakota that the figures I have given indicate for every year a decrease in the sheep population in the United States. Unless the wool industry is supported and unless the wool producers can see ahead a few years and can anticipate receiving prices which will enable them to sell their product at a profit, there is every chance that the wool industry in the United States will disappear.

I feel that Senate bill 814, if enacted, would encourage the wool producer to go ahead and start to increase his flocks. That is the only way the wool production in the United States can be brought back to what it was in the prewar days.

Mr. President, I spoke of the wages being paid to workers in the sheep industry. Feed that has to be fed to the sheep in the winter time, and prior to lambing, has also advanced in price from two to three hundred percent, and still remains at the high price. Before the war the wool producer in the West, in the Rocky Mountain States anyway, could buy for his flocks hay in the stack at from five to six dollars a ton. The price of that hay now is from \$15 to \$20 a ton, which was the price during the war.

We may be told that the sheep producer has probably made more money than he has ever made in his life. That is not true. He has probably received more money for his product than he has ever before received in his life, but he certainly has not made a greater profit. In fact, his margin of profit is so low that if we took into consideration any interest on his investment we would find he would not be making any profit whatsoever.

The thought behind the bill is that after a few years of this support price the wool-raising industry, the sheep-producing industry, will probably be on a more normal level.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. MILLIKIN. With respect to the gross amount of money that has come for wool, it is my understanding that in 1942 the gross was \$157,235,480, and in 1946 it was \$122,713,680, which would tend to refute the thought that the grower of wool is getting more for his product than he ever got before.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. What the Senator says is absolutely correct.

Mr. President, I am satisfied that Senate bill 814 meets the needs of the situation better and is more satisfactory to the Department of Agriculture, the wool producer, and, I will be bold enough to say, the wool dealer and the wool manufacturer, than any other bill which has been presented to this body for many days. I therefore ask the earnest support of Senate bill 814 by Senators.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I am vitally interested in the proposed legislation, for it is quite obvious to me that unless the pending

bill is enacted before the 15th of April, chaos will ensue not only in respect to the wool held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, but in respect to the shear or the clip which is now taking place in some of the southern and western areas of the sheep-producing sections of the Nation.

In the event no action is taken by Congress we are going to find that all the wool that is today held by the Commodity Credit Corporation will remain upon the fixed shelf on which it is now resting, until such time as all the foreign wool that is in surplus in both the British Isles and other wool-producing nations shall have been disposed of.

So, Mr. President, the question before the Members of the United States Senate today is whether we shall pass some kind of legislation, or have the United States in such a position that all the surplus wool in the world will be dumped here, and our own will remain upon an inventory basis in the Commodity Credit Corporation. That is about the position in which we find ourselves.

We could continue to discuss this matter for the next 2 hours, and I think we would have to come right back to the fact that we are today holding about 2 years' shear, and we have been the market for the importation of foreign wool all the while. That is about the situation.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The Senator is absolutely correct. Before the war started, as I have said, our annual consumption of wool was around 600,000,000 pounds. In 1946 our consumption was around 1,000,000,000 pounds. This year the consumption is at the same high figure, 1,000,000,000 pounds.

Recurring to the figures I gave earlier in my remarks, of the 1,000,000,000 pounds consumed in 1946, 800,000,000 pounds was imported wool. As the Senator from Minnesota has pointed out, that resulted in but 200,000,000 pounds of our domestic clip being used, and the remainder has been stock piled, until today there is a stock pile of some 480,000,000 pounds.

One of the clauses of the bill provides that the Commodity Credit Corporation can sell that wool below parity in order to get rid of it. I do not mean by that, nor does the bill mean, that it is necessary to sacrifice this wool. It is not. There is today but 5 cents difference between the price of the domestic wool at the 1946 price level and the foreign importation with the 34-cent tariff.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Did I not hear the Senator from Wyoming say to the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], that he would be willing to strike out the first part of section 2, which has to do with price? I ask that question because the Senator from Ohio had to go to a committee meeting, and he asked me to take the matter up with the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts is correct, and I ask unanimous consent to amend Senate bill 814 on page

1, line 8, after the word "at," by striking out the words "the higher of (1) 90 percent of the comparable price for wool as of January of the calendar year in which the wool is produced, or (2)." I ask to strike those words out so that the provision will then read:

The Commodity Credit Corporation is directed, through loans, purchases, or other operations to support a price to producers of wool produced (shorn or pulled) in the calendar years 1947-48 in the United States and its Territories at the price at which the Commodity Credit Corporation has undertaken to support wool in 1946.

GROWERS DESERVE COMPARABLE PRICE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I desire to say to my colleague that I regret that the situation in the Senate seems to be such that he feels it necessary to surrender this provision of the bill. I personally feel that the wool growers of the United States are entitled to the support at the comparable base. Parity does not do justice to the growers. Does the Senator feel that it is absolutely essential to agree to this amendment in order to secure action today? I realize, of course, that there is considerable pressure upon the Senate to act upon other matters which are before us.

I know how important it is to the wool industry to have some action even though it cannot get what it deserves, and I intend to take no step that will prevent action; but I feel that in demanding of us who have been sponsoring this bill that we surrender the comparable price, those who ask for that are demanding a very serious concession upon our part. Does the Senator feel that he must make this concession?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I agree with what my colleague has said, but in order to meet the dead line of April 15 I feel that it is of the utmost importance that immediate action should be taken on this bill, and I feel that by making that concession and agreeing to the 1946 price, as against the comparable price of 1947, we shall be sending the bill forward to the House, if passed here, in time for the House to act on the resolution which they have, to bring this about before the dead line of April 15.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, the bill which was recommended by the Committee on Agriculture last year carried this program to the end of 1950, and beyond, for the purpose of permanently stabilizing the wool industry. The committee has before it the bill which carries the program on only until the end of 1948, so that there has been a very substantial concession in that respect. However, as I said to the Senator, I have no disposition to impede the progress of the legislation. I wonder, however, whether, in making this concession, we have any reason to believe that our friends from Massachusetts will go along with us and support the measure after we have made this additional concession. Having stripped us of almost everything that we need and that we ought to have, and that we deserve, will not the Senators from Massachusetts now be content to support the bill, if the Senator from Wyoming agrees to this considerable concession?

Mr. SALTONSTALL and Mr. TAFT addressed the Chair.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I hope, before the Senator yields, I may have an answer to my question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has the floor. Does he yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield first to the Senator from Massachusetts, for the purpose of answering my colleague's question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in answer to the senior Senator from Wyoming, I would say most respectfully that I have, at the proper time, a substitute bill to offer, which I hope will be helpful to the wool growers and helpful to the woolen trade of Massachusetts.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will bear with me, I want to point this out, that the bill which the Committee on Agriculture overwhelmingly recommended to the Senate provided for the comparable price formula. My colleague has most generously conceded the point, to abandon that formula, and to take the price at which wool was supported in 1946. The Senator from Massachusetts proposes to ask that we take, not that, but 90 percent of the parity price.

I suggest, Mr. President, and my able colleague, that our friends from Massachusetts are really trying to take the short wool with the long wool.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say in reply to the senior Senator from Wyoming that he was once himself a Massachusetts citizen. He learned his trade with us in Massachusetts. He learned his persuasive arguments in Massachusetts, and that is what I am meeting this afternoon.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I made the suggestion originally that this amendment be adopted in accordance with the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture of the United States, which are contained in the report, from which I quote as follows:

In 1946 the Commodity Credit Corporation paid on the average between 41 and 42 cents a pound for wool in the grease. On the basis of January 1947 figures, the support price for wool, as proposed in the present bill, would be 44.1 cents a pound for 1947. In order to sell domestic wools during the past year in competition with imported wools, the Commodity Credit Corporation has incurred a considerable loss. To establish the support level as proposed in the present bill would undoubtedly result in even greater losses for 1947. If the present parity-price level continues through January 1948, losses during 1948 probably would also be greater than in 1946. We recommend, therefore—

This is the Department of Agriculture of the present administration.

We recommend, therefore, that the support price level for the 2-year period be "not less than the price at which the Commodity Credit Corporation supported wool in 1946."

The establishment of a comparable price for wool and for lambs could then await study of the whole problem of revising the parity formula which was discussed with the House Committee on Agriculture on January 22 and with your committee on January 23.

The amendment carries out the recommendations of the Department of Agriculture. Of course, this whole program is an emergency proposition; it merely takes care of the wool problem temporarily; it is certainly not a broad solution of the whole wool problem. I hope we may have time to work out such a solution, and, if possible, work it out before, at least, we confront the 1948 problem. But in this emergency situation and since under the bill the wool bought by the Commodity Credit Corporation will be sold at a loss anyway, it seems to me only reasonable to ask the wool growers that they take the 41- and 42-cent price which has been guaranteed, and we can determine later what kind of parity there should be, what kind of comparable price there should be. I certainly shall oppose the proposal of the Senator from Massachusetts that there be this other basis, which would be lower than the comparable price, but it seems to me that this is a reasonable proposal at the present time, and in accord with the recommendations of the Democratic administration.

Mr. CAPPER and Mr. DONNELL addressed the Chair.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I will yield to the Senator from Missouri, after I have yielded to the Senator from Kansas. I wish to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I have just received a letter from Edward A. O'Neal, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, in which he says:

I understand the Senate plans to consider the three important agriculture bills—S. 814, providing a program to safeguard the price of wool; H. R. 2102, providing for a temporary continuation of the farm-labor program; and S. 350, providing for the extension of the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation—all of which have been favorably reported by your committee.

The American Farm Bureau Federation strongly supports and urges the speedy enactment of these three measures.

(1) Wool: S. 814 establishes a comparable price for wool and directs that the price of wool be supported at 90 percent of the comparable price or at the level of the 1946 support price, whichever is higher, until the end of the Steagall period, December 31, 1948, and authorizes the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell wool at prices competitive with foreign wool in order to enable the Corporation to dispose of its surplus stocks in an orderly manner. The present wool program is scheduled to expire April 15 and the growers will be left without protection for their new crop unless this legislation is speedily enacted. This legislation seeks to give the wool growers comparable price support assistance that has already been extended to other commodities under the Steagall Act and the Bankhead Commodity Loan Act. We strongly oppose S. 917, which seeks to establish a much lower price support level. This would be very unfair to the wool growers because the present parity price of wool is out of line with the parity price of other commodities.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, in regard to the amendment

which I proposed, which the Senator from Ohio had suggested to me, I wish to ask unanimous consent to correct the wording as stated by me, in order to bring it into line with what the Senator from Ohio had in mind and with what he pointed out the Department of Agriculture had stated in their report on the bill. So on page 2, line 2, after the word "price", I desire to insert the words "not less than that", and eliminate the word "at", so that it will read:

The price not less than that which the Commodity Credit Corporation has undertaken to support wool in 1946.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to modify his amendment, as he has done.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, now that the Senator from Ohio, in explanation of his position, has made it clear that he will not support the proposal of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] to drive down further the price which the domestic producers of wool may receive, I shall not make any objection to the unanimous consent request of my colleague.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], as modified.

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I desire to ask the junior Senator from Wyoming a question. He has by his amendment stricken out of section 2 the reference to the comparable price for wool as of January of the calendar year in which the wool is produced. In that connection I ask him whether or not section 3 of the bill, which provides an obligation upon the Secretary of Agriculture to establish monthly a comparable price for wool, and so forth, should remain in the bill, or whether section 3 should be stricken out. I shall be glad if the Senator will state his views in that regard.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I shall be glad to state them. Section 3 is merely a directive to the Secretary of Agriculture to establish monthly a comparable price for wool as with other commodities, such as cotton, corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, and peanuts, but it would have nothing to do with the price which would be paid for wool in view of the fact that my amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator further what useful purpose would be subserved by the establishment of the comparable price for wool if that price were not to enter into the computation to be made under section 2 of this measure?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. It would give us the information which is necessary we should have to know month by month what the comparable price would be as compared to the price we are receiving.

Mr. DONNELL. So the amendment made thus far by the Senator to section 2 would not, in his opinion, make advis-

able the further amendment of striking out section 3?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I should prefer that section 3 remain in the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the fact that the bill extends the support price for a period of 2 years only, and if section 3 is left in the bill, which provides for a study of the comparable price, and announcement of the comparable price month by month, it could form a valuable basis for future studies because it is perfectly obvious that after the life of the Steagall amendment expires, after 1947 and 1948, we will have to have a more permanent agricultural policy for our country and we will need all the material of this nature we can secure in order to effectuate an intelligent policy. So I think it would be valuable as a basis for future studies.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator. I understand therefore, and if I am incorrect I should be glad to be corrected, that the only purpose of leaving section 3 in the bill is to provide from month to month the information therein required to be obtained, and that there is no mandatory requirement upon either the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other agency or official to use that information in fixing prices under this bill or elsewhere. Am I correct in that?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The Senator is correct.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry. Will the Chair state the question before the Senate at the present time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I rise to a further parliamentary inquiry. Is it in order at the present time, if no amendments are pending, to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the entire bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such an amendment to the bill presently being considered would be in order.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is in order now to present a bill as a substitute for the pending bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As an amendment in the nature of a substitute; yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Then, Mr. President, in behalf of my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] and myself I offer Senate bill 917 as an amendment in the nature of a substitute for Senate bill 814.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert the following:

That this act may be cited as the "Domestic Wool Act of 1947."

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, through loans or purchases, to protect the price to producers of domestic wool in the continental United States and Territories during the period April 15, 1947, to

December 31, 1948. The loan or purchase level for wool during this period shall not be in excess of 90 per centum of the parity price for wool as determined from time to time by the Secretary of Agriculture under the present method of computation.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is further authorized, without regard to restrictions imposed by any law to dispose of existing domestic wool stocks and such further stocks as may be acquired under this act, at prices which will permit such wool to be sold in competition with imported wool.

(c) The Secretary of Agriculture is further authorized to adjust loan and purchase levels for individual grades and qualities for the purpose of bringing about a fair and equitable relationship in the loan and purchase levels for the various grades and qualities of wool and may make discounts from loan and purchase levels for off-quality, inferior-grade, or poorly prepared wool.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to speak briefly on Senate bill 814 and the bill I have offered on behalf of my colleague and myself, as a substitute therefor. In the first place the wool industry in Massachusetts has no desire to put the wool growers of this country out of business. In fact, in ordinary times they depend upon the American wool growers to a great extent for their business. They want them to continue in business. They want the domestic production to increase. At the same time they would like this honorable body to remember that if the pending bill becomes law and the policy which it represents shall be continued, then over a period of years—I do not say it will happen in the next 2 years—but over a period of years—it will ultimately deprive approximately 3,000 workers in Massachusetts of employment and in the country at large it will deprive approximately 6,000 workers of employment. I am informed that such is the extent of the wool trade in this country as apart from the wool growers and apart from the wool manufacturers.

In substance, what this bill, if it should become law, will do over a period of years is to put the Government into the exclusive position of buying and selling all the domestic wool. The wool trade in Boston and Massachusetts is one of the oldest businesses in Massachusetts. It is an honorable trade, it is a respected trade, and it has a legitimate function in the business of our country. But what we want to do—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Wyoming. I have but a few remarks to make, and I should like to finish them, but am glad to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator, and I shall not interrupt him again. I understood the Senator to say that if the bill which has just been explained by my colleague should be passed it would result in driving the wool trade of Boston out of business and depriving some 6,000 persons of their jobs.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I said "ultimately."

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Ultimately. The bill which my colleague is sponsoring declares a policy for a period ending December 31, 1948. The substitute which the Senator now proposes provides a pro-

gram which ends on December 31, 1948. The bill which my colleague has defended provides for the purchase of wool by the Commodity Credit Corporation at the level at which wool was purchased during the year 1946. The bill offered by the Senator from Massachusetts provides for the support purchase of wool at 90 percent of parity. I should like to ask the Senator on what logical basis he asks the Senate to believe that the wool trade of Boston will not be driven out of business if the Commodity Credit Corporation purchases wool at 90 percent of parity, but will be driven out of business if the Commodity Credit Corporation purchases it at the price of 1946, under which the wool trade prospered?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will answer the Senator's inquiry in this way: It will allow the wool trade and citizens engaged in private enterprise an opportunity to buy some of the domestic wool at market prices. At this time, in answer to the Senator's question, I should like to read some figures into the Record which I intend to place in the Record at a little later time.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. DONNELL. I realize that the Senator wishes to proceed, but I should like to ask him one question. I observe in Senate bill 814 the requirement that—

The Commodity Credit Corporation is directed, through loans, purchases, or other operations to support a price to producers of wool produced (shorn or pulled) in the calendar years 1947 and 1948 in the United States and its Territories at the higher of (1) 90 percent of the comparable price for wool as of January of the calendar year in which the wool is produced, or (2) the price at which the Commodity Credit Corporation has undertaken to support wool in 1946.

The question I desire to propound to the Senator is, Did the Commodity Credit Corporation undertake to support wool in 1946 at one price throughout the year or did that price vary from time to time during the year 1946? If it varied, which price, in the opinion of the Senator, would govern in this particular language in Senate bill 814—the lowest price, or the highest price, or some intermediate price?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. In answer to the Senator's inquiry I should say that I have only one price, that at which wool was bought in 1946. I cannot tell the Senator whether wool was bought at different prices. I do know the price at which the Secretary of Agriculture says the CCC bought wool in 1946, and that is the price I should like to use.

Mr. President, I shall now place in the Record the list of prices, which, to the best of my information is correct. Prices are given both for wool in grease and for clean fine wool.

The 1946 prices—which is the proposal of the junior Senator from Wyoming—are 42.1 cents for wool in grease, and \$1.25 for clean fine wool. Ninety percent of parity, which is the proposal submitted by the Senators from Massachusetts, would give prices of 37.7 cents for wool in grease, and \$1.11 for clean fine wool. The present price of wool on the market is 38 cents for wool

in grease, and \$1.20 for clean fine wool. I shall add the price of comparable wool, which is now no longer in the discussion. Ninety percent of the comparable price for wool is 46.9 cents for wool in grease, and \$1.39 for clean fine wool. All these prices are as of April 1, 1947.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator give us the source of his figures?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The source of my figures is the National Wool Trade Association.

Mr. AIKEN. The figure submitted to the committee by the Department of Agriculture for 90 percent of the price of comparable wool was 44.1 cents.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with the Senator that that was the figure as of the first of the year. These figures are as of April 1, 1947.

Mr. AIKEN. Is the market price for grease wool, which the Senator gave as 38 cents, the April 1 price?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Thirty-eight cents is the present market price for wool in grease.

Mr. AIKEN. As of April 1?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As of April 1.

Mr. AIKEN. I thank the Senator. I did not understand that he was giving the April 1 prices.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these figures, in the form of a table, printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[April 1, 1947]

	Greasy	Clean fine
	Cents	Dollars
90 percent of comparable.....	46.9	1.39
1946 prices.....	42.1	1.25
90 percent of parity.....	37.7	1.11
Present foreign wool with duty (34 cents) added.....	38.0	1.20

Mr. SALTONSTALL. At the present time the Government has approximately 480,000,000 pounds of wool as an inventory. That is 30,000,000 pounds more than was mentioned by the junior Senator from Wyoming, but I think that is the correct figure as of the present time.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. My figure of 450,000,000 pounds was approximate only. It varies from month to month.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senators from Massachusetts are entirely in accord with the Senators from Wyoming, in that this inventory of wool should be eliminated in an orderly manner. The inventory of wool, which represents the domestic wool purchased by the Government, has been built up because the market price of wool has been under the price at which the Government could sell it. If either of the bills becomes law it will permit the Government, in an orderly way, to get rid of the big inventory

of wool and make the market a more orderly one in the future.

The bill of the Senator from Wyoming also makes wool a basic agricultural commodity. I mentioned that not because it necessarily affects the price at which the Government will buy wool under the formula suggested, but because it may affect the purchase by the Government, at a different level, of many other agricultural commodities. That information is obtained from page 4 of the committee's report on Senate bill 814, and is the statement of the Secretary of Agriculture. He says:

To add wool to the six basic commodities now named in existing legislation might result in changing the computation of comparable prices and support prices for many of the other commodities which are affected by section 4 (a) and (b) of the Stagall amendment and other legislation.

I mention that that provision is still in the bill of the Senator from Wyoming, and in the opinion of the Department of Agriculture it might have the effect described on the cost prices of other commodities.

What we in Massachusetts want is to help the wool grower to make it possible for the wool trader to stay in business, and not to keep the Government in the wool business indefinitely.

As the Senator has said, in ordinary years we buy between 600,000,000 and 700,000,000 pounds of wool. During the past few years we have bought as much as 1,000,000,000 pounds of wool. When we get back to the normal level of 600,000,000 to 700,000,000 pounds, our domestic crop will be approximately half of all we use. What we want to do is to make it possible to use that domestic crop by placing a floor under the prices for the wool grower, so that the price of wool will not fall as low as 8 cents, as it did in 1932, and to keep the Government out of business so far as we can do so.

This is a stopgap law for 1947 and 1948. However, we must remember that if this bill becomes law and those who are now in the wool trade have to go out of that business, or suffer a substantial reduction in their business, we may find if we try to adopt some new system in 1949 there will not be the market for wool that there is at the present time.

As I understand, the wool cooperatives sell about 20 percent of the domestic supply. The remainder 80 percent is sold by the wool trade. They have not been able to get any of it in the last few years, because it has been off the market, and, consequently, to supply the market they have to buy foreign wools.

What the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] says as to 80 percent of the wool coming in from the foreign market is entirely correct. But that is not the fault of the woolen mills or the fault of the wool traders. It is the fault of the Government in keeping the price so high that the wool traders cannot buy the wool and sell it to the wool industry, because the industry cannot pay that price when they can obtain wool from abroad at a cheaper price.

What has been the result? The Bureau of the Budget, in response to a letter from me, states that as of June 30, 1947, it is estimated that the Commodity

Credit Corporation will have outstanding in the price-support program approximately \$225,970,000, of which \$169,000,000 will be in wool and the balance in other commodities. As of June 30, 1948, they estimate the total price-support program will be \$348,375,000, of which \$116,000,000 will be in wool. Actually, as of June 30, 1946, the total price-support program was \$472,987,000, of which \$243,416,000, or a little more than half, was in wool. In other words, the expenditures which it has been necessary for the Commodity Credit Corporation to make in order to sustain the price of wool under the laws which have been passed, has amounted to more than half of all the expenditures it has had to make for the entire price-support program for all commodities.

As I have already pointed out, in two particulars this bill goes further than the Acting Secretary of Agriculture recommended in his report to the committee. The Senator from Wyoming has corrected one, and wool as a basic commodity is still in the bill. The Senator has argued that the flocks of sheep in this country are diminishing. I submit most respectfully that 80 percent of the weight value and 66 percent of the money value of sheep is in meat and one-third of the money value is in wool. In the past few years meat prices have been very high, and at the same time the Government has been supporting wool. That situation has already been discussed. It does not seem that the wool producer has suffered.

In conclusion, let me reiterate that the Massachusetts wool trade has no desire to put the wool growers out of business. They want to encourage the domestic supply of wool, stay in business themselves, and keep the Government out of the business. If I know anything of what is desired in this country today, it is the free-enterprise system. We do not want the Government put in the position of having to buy and sell in peacetime the ordinary necessities of life.

The question of tariffs and quotas has been referred to. The wool traders of Boston certainly are not against higher tariffs, if that be the answer to the problem of the wool grower. They are against quotas. I think, although I do not know this, that the wool growers themselves are against quotas. The wool trade is against the quota system because the situation is too uncertain. The amount of wool used this year and the amount of wool to be used next year are so variable that it would be almost impossible for any administrator properly to fix the price quotas.

So, Mr. President, I conclude these few remarks by saying that we want some bill; we do not want to end all legislation on the subject. We want a floor put under the wool grower's prices, but we do not want the floor so high that we cannot compete in the free wool market in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask one question of the junior Senator from Wyoming, if he will be kind enough to answer. In 1946 was the price at which the Commodity Credit Corporation undertook to support wool the same throughout the entire 12 months?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. The average price for fine wool during that period was 41.6 cents.

Mr. DONNELL. But the price itself varied in different portions of the year 1946, did it not?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Not materially.

Mr. DONNELL. Was it substantially the same at all times?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. It was substantially the same at all times.

Mr. DONNELL. The point I had in mind was that which I suggested to the Senator from Massachusetts, namely, that in section 2 the Commodity Credit Corporation is directed to support a price in 1947 and 1948 not less than that at which the Commodity Credit Corporation has undertaken to support wool in 1946. If the price varied at different times during the year 1946 it would seem to me that there is an ambiguity in this section which should be cleared.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. There is no ambiguity. The Department of Agriculture knows very well what the price was in 1946, and that will be the price, and not less than that price, for wool under this bill.

Mr. DONNELL. In January of 1946 it was substantially the same as it was in December of 1946?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Department of Agriculture did not support a price of 90 percent of parity, or 96 percent of parity. It supported a price at a level which is felt necessary to save a vanishing agricultural industry from extinction. At this time, as I recall, it is supporting the price of wool at 105 or 106 percent of parity. During the war it supported it as high as 118 percent of parity; but that was a price which the Department determined was necessary in order to keep the wool grower in the business of producing wool, and was not fixed according to any percentage of parity.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming one further question. There was some variation between the prices at which the Commodity Credit Corporation undertook to support wool in a number of periods in 1946, was there not?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. I do not think there was, for the identical type of wool. There are so many different types of wool that it is very rarely that two different types would have the same price. But for actually the same type of wool, the same kind of wool, the price was the same.

Mr. DONNELL. Throughout the entire year?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Throughout the year.

Mr. DONNELL. The Senator does not regard it as necessary, therefore, to insert the words "the average" in this section?

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. DONNELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, the bill introduced by the Senators from Massachusetts and offered as an amendment to the pending bill is, I believe, written by the Boston wool trade. I need only read the first four or five words:

To encourage the production of sheep.

How is it possible to encourage the production of sheep when the purpose is to reduce the price of wool at a time when the industry is being liquidated?

Figures have been presented to show that the sheep population is now the lowest in 68 years; but still the Boston wool trade proposes to lower wool prices still more and force still more liquidation, at a time when the Boston wool trade itself is making plenty of money. In fact, the number of dealers in the Boston wool trade has increased. There are more dealers now than there were 5 years ago. They handle all the wool for the Commodity Credit Corporation on a fee basis. They store all the wool at a good profit. It is true that possibly they do not make quite so much money as if there were a fluctuating gambling market, but they make a reasonable profit with which they ought to be satisfied.

I should like to read a portion of a statement which I made before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and should like to have the remainder of it inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. YOUNG. Briefly, Mr. President, the statement to which I have referred shows that the president of Draper & Co. received a total compensation, including basic salary, bonus, and premiums paid on annuity contracts, of \$161,000; and the statement also shows that other officials of his company received up to \$90,000 a year and more—all at a time when the wool-growing industry in this country was being liquidated. So I cannot understand why they should appear before the Senate committee and present themselves as an industry going out of business. It seems to me absolutely absurd.

At the present time, and for many years past, the price of wool has been supported by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Since the existence of the Commodity Credit Corporation, it has had an over-all net profit of \$55,000,000 in its program in support of all farm prices. That is contrary to the statements made in numerous articles appearing in magazines and newspapers in the United States. Occasionally there is a little loss by the Commodity Credit Corporation in connection with its support of certain farm prices, but the Corporation has had an over-all net profit during all the years of its existence, of \$55,000,000.

Let us compare that situation, Mr. President, with the situation of industry, which during the war years was guaranteed a return on the basis of cost plus profit. The War Department in connection with its cancellations of contracts with business, paid business, up to February 28, 1947, \$4,694,055,000. The Navy Department paid business a gross of \$1,236,900,000—and that at a time when the Commodity Credit Corporation, in connection with its program for the support of agricultural prices—the prices of commodities just as important to the country during the war as the production of other goods or articles needed in the war—had an actual profit of \$55,000,000.

There are other subjects which I should like to discuss, but time now will not permit, to show how business constantly, and even as of today, has received large subsidies—for instance, huge subsidies have been paid to the copper, zinc, and lead producers as well as to other industries—whereas the farm price-support program has constantly shown a profit.

Mr. President, Senate bill 814 is supported by the Farm Bureau, the Grange, and every other major farm organization. It has the approval of the Department of Agriculture, and it has the wholehearted support of the National Wool Growers Association. In opposition to it there is only the Boston wool trade, which will exist regardless of whether this bill is passed.

EXHIBIT A

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MILTON R. YOUNG

Mr. Malcolm Green, who was asked to testify in behalf of the wool-trades position by Senator SALTONSTALL and who, it is expected will testify for the wool trade at a later date, is the vice president of Draper & Co.

Draper & Co. is one of the largest handlers of wool in the United States and in addition to handling raw wool has a subsidiary company which makes tops (known as the Draper Top Co.).

This company never attempted to become a handler of domestic wool during this war period under the Government's wool-purchase program. This program began in April 1943 and has continued since. Three domestic clips of wool handled during the war. Draper & Co. did not assist or take any part in this program.

It is difficult to understand why they now step in and oppose a program which is designed to care for the domestic producer, since they have had no interest in him during this period, unless it is for the purpose of continuing their high speculative profits.

This company had a review of its profits by the Internal Revenue Bureau just recently. A statement of this review and decision by the Bureau is attached herewith.

This statement refers only to the salaries, bonuses, and pensions of the officers. It does not show the net profit to the company, which undoubtedly must have been great considering the salaries, and so forth, paid.

Mr. Malcolm Green, when testifying before the Senate Agriculture Committee, stated that the only reason for opposing the growers was to permit a good old Boston industry to live. The Internal Revenue has another name for it.

A case in The Tax Court of the United States of America, Docket No. 6376, promulgated September 28, 1945, Draper & Co., Inc.,

petitioner, v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue, respondent, in which the rather startling statement is made, as follows:

"4. Officers' compensation disallowed, \$271,218.41: Officers' compensation of \$156,000, representing basic salaries paid, plus bonus equal to 100 percent thereof, has been allowed as reasonable compensation for serv-

ices rendered. The amount of \$427,218.41 claimed in the return in excess thereof, or \$271,218.41, is therefore determined to be excessive compensation for services actually rendered and not deductible as ordinary and necessary expenses."

The table gives the amounts claimed and the amounts allowed.

CLAIMED

Name	Basic salary	Bonus	Premiums paid on annuity contracts	Total
Paul A. Draper, president and treasurer.....	\$30,000	\$102,000	\$29,350.81	\$161,350.81
Robert W. Dana, vice president.....	18,000	72,000	17,579.00	107,579.00
Malcolm Green, vice president.....	18,000	72,000	17,579.00	107,579.00
George W. Brown, assistant treasurer.....	12,000	27,000	11,709.60	50,709.60
Amounts claimed.....	78,000	273,000	76,218.41	427,218.41

ALLOWED

Name	Basic salary	Bonus	Premiums paid on annuity contracts	Total
Paul A. Draper.....	\$30,000	\$30,000	None	\$60,000.00
Robert W. Dana.....	18,000	18,000	None	36,000.00
Malcolm Green.....	18,000	18,000	None	36,000.00
George W. Brown.....	12,000	12,000	None	24,000.00
Amounts allowed.....	78,000	78,000	None	156,000.00
Amounts disallowed.....	None	195,000	76,218.41	271,218.41

Yet, Malcolm Green, vice president of Draper & Co., is one of the parties who has been spearheading the attack upon wool growers, and, through the wool-trades activities and their corps of attorney-lobbyists in Washington, are seeking to force lower prices on domestic wool.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I recognize that the hour is growing late, and therefore I shall detain the Senate for only a few minutes.

I wish the RECORD to show my hope that the bill which the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and I have introduced will be adopted as a substitute for the pending measure.

As the Senate realizes, my immediate interest in this measure is due to the fact that the Boston wool trade is located in the State which I have the honor in part to represent; and there are some 6,000 people, 3,000 of whom are in Massachusetts, whose livelihood is involved.

It stands to reason that a bill such as the one now pending, which would continue the Government in the wool business, is naturally dangerous to the employment of people who themselves are engaged in the wool trade, a business which has had a clean record and is more than 100 years old. Nor is it necessary to dwell very long on the fact that this wool will be sold at a loss. I believe the estimate is that \$75,000,000 will be lost this year, and, of course, that loss will have to be borne by the American taxpayers.

My colleague has advanced the very valid argument that legislation of this kind is definitely a step away from getting the Government out of this type of economic activity. I understand that the Under Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Dodd, has testified that the Department of Agriculture hoped to be able to get out of the wool business. Of course, legislation of this type is not a step in that direction.

Mr. President, the longer I serve as a Member of the Senate, the more I am impressed with the fact that all of us are essentially members of one team. We have the wool growers who raise the wool; we have the people in the wool trade, who handle the wool, buy it, and sell it; we have the laborers and the management who process wool and make it into things which you and I wear; and then we have the consumers who wear it. Certainly it is entirely possible that those of us who serve in the Congress have the brains to fashion a measure which will reconcile all those different interests and place this vital activity on a sound footing, for it certainly is a vital activity and one which in time of war has shown how important it is.

Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate any longer, but I wish the RECORD to show my hope that Senate bill 917 will be substituted for Senate bill 814.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I desire to make a few remarks in support of the bill reported by the committee. I agree with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] that Congress should do everything in its power to withdraw the Federal Government from competition with private industry or private enterprise. I wish to point out that this bill would merely continue for 2 years the Government's interest in supporting the price of wool on a basis comparable to that which already is maintained by the Federal Government for the basic commodities and the so-called Steagall commodities.

I wish to point out further that those engaged in the wool industry are asking for no special consideration at this time. In the early years of the war those engaged in the production of wool recognized the need for wool in the national defense and in the prosecution of the war. They were among the last producing groups in the United States to ask

for any support or assistance or cooperation from the Federal Government in connection with handling their particular commodity.

Recently the President declared the official end of hostilities; but under existing statutes the Federal Government is obligated to support the prices of the Steagall and basic commodities during the years 1947 and 1948. The proposed legislation would merely give the same consideration to wool. Unless that is accorded the wool industry, there will, in fact, be discrimination against it.

I desire to support wholeheartedly the bill of the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] which has been reported favorably by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I think its enactment is essential and vital in preserving for wool the same price protection that is given other commodities.

Mr. President, we wish this action to be taken now, so as to enable the other branch of Congress to take action prior to April 15.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I do not wish to prolong the debate in any way, but I should like to mention that for the first time in history the Boston wool dealers are handling 800,000,000 pounds of wool a year, and many competent persons say that the consumption of 1,000,000,000 pounds of wool a year will continue. I confess Mr. President, that I am not that optimistic. I do not believe that the consumption can remain at that figure for many years. It seems to me that probably it will drop to somewhere around 800,000,000 pounds.

I cannot for the life of me see how the jobs of 6,000, or 1,000, or 100 people employed in the Boston wool dealers' business are in jeopardy in any way whatsoever.

I hope the Senate will reject the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, before the vote is taken I should like to say just a few words in reference to the support price on wool. This is more than a support program. Under this scheme the Government is proposing to guarantee wartime prices for the next two years to a group of wool producers at the expense and to the disadvantage of all other farmers.

As has been pointed out by Senators, the act we are considering is a wartime measure. It is a measure which was passed during the war for the protection of wool farmers, with a definite understanding on the part of those farmers that it would expire when the war was over; and the war is now over. I am not arguing that the wool farmers are not entitled to some consideration, but they are not entitled to receive any more consideration than is afforded the producers of other agricultural commodities.

I have here a few figures I should like to read to show how the money under the program proposed would be distributed. The latest estimated figure I have been able to obtain as to the cost to the

taxpayers is \$32,000,000, and the highest estimate from other sources is \$75,000,000. For the purpose of this argument I have taken the figure of \$32,000,000 a year.

The State of Wyoming would receive \$2,500,000, and their proportionate part of the payment through Federal income taxes would be \$30,000.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Where did the Senator get these figures?

Mr. WILLIAMS. From the Department of Agriculture Yearbook of 1946, which I have here, and I shall be glad to have the Senator from North Dakota show me wherein I am wrong.

Mr. YOUNG. Are the figures based on a loss? There may be a profit, as there has been on many commodities.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator thinks there is any probability of a profit, then there would be no need for the support price. The farmers would make more money without it. So, all those in favor of the measure are acting under the assumption there would be a loss.

Mr. YOUNG. If there should be no bill passed at all, there would be no way of disposing of the wool. It would remain on the shelves.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Government could dispose of this wool today as readily as 2 years hence when the proposed legislation is to expire. My estimate as to losses were obtained from the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. YOUNG. As to the probable losses?

Mr. WILLIAMS. As to the probable losses under the bill if it shall be passed.

Mr. YOUNG. That is entirely different from the information given to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I was talking to Mr. Cooper of the Department of Agriculture today as to estimated losses.

The State of Idaho would receive \$1,100,000, and its proportionate payment would be \$55,000.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Does the Senator think that 42 cents a pound for the raw wool, or even 41 cents or less, is too high for the producer to receive in this day and age?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not know enough about the price of wool, and what it should be, to answer the question, but I will say that the wool grower has no more right to this subsidy than other farmers.

Mr. THYE. Again may I impose upon the Senator's time for just a slight observation on this question? During the war years there had to be held in reserve a great amount of wool for war purposes, and because it was held in reserve there was a great accumulation of foreign wool held in the British Isles, as well as the wool we had under our own Commodity Credit Corporation.

In the event the Commodity Credit Corporation were to cease the support price, then the wool price would have to drop to whatever level at which it happened to find itself, would it not? It

might go to 34, it might go to 38, but it is quite obvious that it would drop until the time when foreign wool would no longer find it profitable to come to America. Only then would we commence to use up not only our own clip of today, but the clips we have in storage under the Commodity Credit Corporation holding. So the question is simply this, Should we further ruin the sheep-producing areas of the Nation, and drive them down to a position lower than that in which they already find themselves, or should we give consideration to some type of support program for the wool producer? As I see the situation, we are either going to support the price, or the price is going to drop until the foreigner ceases to export his wool to this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Surprising as it seems, I agree 100 percent with the Senator from Minnesota. On the other hand, the same statement could be made in connection with any commodity that is produced here. I know the price would drop, and would seek its level, because I happen to come from the northeastern section, where the price of commodities is not held up by a support program, and I know exactly what happens to the market price. The American farmers have to bring production down to peacetime requirements as they did following World War I or Congress has to establish an over-all support program. The only way that can be done is to socialize agriculture over a period of years, because we cannot have support prices, we cannot have the Government supporting any agricultural commodity above the free market, unless the Government monopolizes the market.

To continue the statement—and I should like to get these figures into the RECORD—the State of Montana would receive \$2,400,000, but its proportionate part of the payment would be only \$55,000.

The State of Texas would receive \$8,000,000, and pay \$850,000.

The State of Utah would receive \$1,800,000, and would pay only \$60,000.

The State of Colorado would receive \$1,300,000, and would pay \$200,000.

The State of New Mexico would receive \$1,300,000, and would pay \$30,000.

The State of South Dakota would receive \$1,100,000, and would pay \$30,000.

Mr. THYE. I wonder if the Senator would yield again?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. Are those figures based upon an orderly disposal of the Commodity Credit Corporation holdings, or on the basis of the wool price of today as compared to the price when the wool was purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation? Do they represent the result if we were to sell the wool on the market for just what the market would offer as of today? Mr. Dodd did not give us any such figures when he testified before the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Unfortunately, I did not have access to Mr. Dodd's figures, because, as the Senator knows, this bill is being rushed through. It is another emergency. The bill is being rushed through even before we have a chance to see the minutes of the hearings. There-

fore I called Mr. Cooper, who was referred to me as being the wool expert of the Department of Agriculture, and these are the figures he gave me, based upon an estimate of a loss of 10 cents a pound on all wool produced in the United States.

To return to the figures, the State of North Dakota would receive \$600,000, and would pay \$30,000.

To show how this is to the disadvantage of the eastern farmers, I pick three States now. The State of New York will pay \$6,400,000 under the bill, and the New York farmers will receive \$200,000.

Pennsylvania will pay \$2,500,000, under the bill, and the farmers of Pennsylvania will receive \$200,000.

My own State of Delaware will pay \$320,000, and receive a little less than \$1,300.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I should like to ask the junior Senator from Delaware one more question. What is the wool buyer paying for imported wool of quality comparable to that the Commodity Credit Corporation now holds? The Senator said about 10 cents a pound would be the loss. Did he not say that?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Cooper said it was estimated that 10 cents a pound would be the loss if the Commodity Credit Corporation were to continue purchasing all the wool and then have to sell it on the free market in competition with foreign wool. I do not know how nearly accurate that is, but those are Mr. Cooper's figures.

Mr. THYE. Then, in order to protect wool, the tariff should be upped so as to afford a retaining wall. Otherwise the wool industry would be ruined.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree with the Senator on that statement, but it is discouraging to see Senators today favoring a Government hand-out who were yesterday singing the praises of the New Deal trade-agreement program.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think some things pertinent to this subject have not been said which should be brought to the attention of the Senate. First, I think the 10 cents a pound, the figure given to the Senator from Delaware, is completely erroneous, and I do not think anyone in the wool trade, or any wool grower, will dispute my statement.

Next, I am afraid that if we adopt the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts we will be contributing very greatly to the complete decline and ultimate extinction of the wool industry of the United States.

There are wool manufacturers in my State, and at one time Vermont was the most important sheep-producing State in the Union. I think this matter is so big that we cannot look at it from the standpoint of any single area. It is a great national problem which we have to consider. We have got to consider it for this reason. Today our wool growers are not competing with the wool growers of other parts of the world or the wool dealers of other parts of the world; they are competing with the British Empire

for the wool markets of the world. What has happened is this: England has consistently sold wool on the American markets for just under the United States price for wool. Therefore our wool dealers have used a great deal more foreign wool than they have American wool.

For two or three months last summer, for some reason or other, the American price for the domestic wool and the price for the foreign wool were approximately the same, and during that period 170,000,000 pounds of American wool were disposed of for a fair price, but here is what will happen if we adopt the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts: A floor under wool of approximately 36 cents a pound will be fixed. The world price today is 38 cents a pound, but if forced to do so, England will lower her price just below 36 cents a pound, and will continue to supply the American market, just as she has been doing for the last year or two, in an effort to get rid of her own tremendous stock pile of wool, which she is successfully doing.

Furthermore, the wool grower cannot produce wool on parity today. The parity formula is grossly unfair to many agricultural commodities. That is because, for most commodities, the base period goes back to 1913 when conditions were entirely different. Therefore, in order to get production during the war the Government has had to maintain a support price for above parity. Our milk producers have been getting 140 percent of parity. Our poultry producers have been getting 130 percent of parity, during most of the war. They could not have produced at parity price.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will yield, may I say that that was not true of the poultry growers in my State, because our State produces broilers, and they are not included under the support program. I would like to ask the Senator one more question. Could the Senator tell me what parity is?

Mr. AIKEN. Within 2 weeks' time, yes. I am not going to attempt to tell the Senator tonight.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that answers the question.

Mr. AIKEN. But poultry growers under our parity formula received about 130 percent of parity during most of the war years. They could not have produced and made a profit at any less than that. Other producers have received less than parity. The price of wool has been supported at more than parity—105 percent of parity at the present time, and as I said a little while ago, up to 118 percent of parity. So I do not believe that it is safe for us to adopt the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts and run the risk of still further reducing the domestic crop of wool.

There are two basic reasons why the wool industry in the United States should be preserved. The first is that very few materials are of more strategic importance in time of war than wool. War cannot be waged without wool, particularly wars in cold climates; and until somebody can guarantee to this country that we are not going to have any more wars, then we have no right to make

ourselves dependent on a source of wool 10,000 miles away.

The other reason why we should maintain the domestic wool industry is that cutting the price away down would spell economic ruin for 11 or 12 States in the West, and would seriously injure the agriculture of some 20 or 22 other States. There are 48 States in the Union, Mr. President, and the level at which the economy of every one of them is maintained affects every one of the other 47 States. We cannot afford to let the sheep growers of Utah and Wyoming or Idaho or Oregon or California be ruined. It would have a very serious effect on the agricultural and industrial economy of all the rest of the country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I shall yield in a moment to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely want to make a remark at that point.

Mr. AIKEN. I want to say, and then I shall yield the floor to the Senator from Wyoming, that the wool trade throughout the years has performed very useful service. It has bought wool from the producers here and abroad and has supplied our mills, our manufacturers, with a steady supply of wool of the grades they wanted when they wanted it. They have performed a very useful service indeed in that respect. They have made money; indeed, they have made a great deal of money during the war; but in the course of the hearings when the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young] engaged in a discussion with some of the wool traders and told them how much money they had made, they replied, "Yes, we have made a lot of money, but we have made it on the foreign wool; we have not made much money on the domestic wool." Therefore, I do not think our wool trade would be hurt particularly if the domestic wool growing were reduced a great deal further, and provided, of course, that we did not engage in war. Our wool trade would continue making money on the foreign wool; they told us in the committee that they made more money on foreign wool than they did by handling domestic wool, which the Commodity Credit Corporation had turned over to them to handle; but our wool manufacturers would suffer terrifically if Great Britain should ever get a monopoly of the world wool market.

We ought to remember what happened in the case of rubber. It went down to 3 cents, and then it became a Government monopoly. The price went to 22 cents, and we had to pay whatever price was asked. If any other country on earth should ever get a monopoly of the wool market of the world, our manufacturers would find that they would not be paying 90 percent of parity, but would be paying every dollar the traffic would bear, every dollar they have. They would be even greater losers than the growers who would have to go out of business.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon I made inquiry of the junior Senator from Wyoming as to the sufficiency of the general statement of the price at which the Commodity Credit Corporation was undertaking to support wool in 1946. Subsequently I spoke to the Senator from Vermont, who was kind enough to check the matter to the present time. I should be glad if he would be so kind as to place in the RECORD the result of his investigation.

Mr. AIKEN. Since the colloquy between the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Wyoming took place, I have talked with the Undersecretary of Agriculture, and he advises me that 41.6 cents was the price for the year at which wool was supported during 1946. The only variation was a little higher for better grades, and a little lower for poorer grades; which was perfectly proper.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If the Senator will yield, do I understand that the price under this proposed bill would be 41.6 cents a pound.

Mr. AIKEN. It would be not less than 41.6, if it were insisted that the words "no less" be in it. We do not know whether we are headed for a depression or an inflation. There should be some leeway for the Department of Agriculture to protect the wool grower in the event the rest of the prices changed so rapidly it could not be checked.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will yield, does he not know that this computation is 12.9 cents a pound higher than the average price of wool between the years 1934 to 1943?

Mr. AIKEN. Will the Senator repeat the question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I say the average price for wool, 1934 to 1943, according to the Department of Agriculture, was 28.7 cents per pound, and the proposal under this bill supports the price at 12.9 cents per pound higher than the average for those 9 years. In other words, we are supposed to support wool at the highest wartime price known, is that correct?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not question the figures the Senator from Delaware is producing, but I will not say "Yes."

Mr. WILLIAMS. The Senator will find the figures on page 353 of the agricultural statistics for 1946.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not question the figures; but I want to say that if the prices of commodities go back to the 1933, 1934, or 1935 level the economy of the country will become bankrupt. With a \$260,000,000 debt hanging over our heads Government bonds probably would not be worth much more than the paper they are printed on.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But if depression prices hit 60 percent of the agriculture of the United States which is not under the agricultural support programs, and the other 40 percent of farmers are guaranteed wartime prices, how can the 60 percent keep the 40 percent going? How can the farmers of the Senator's own State help support the farmers whose prices are guaranteed?

Mr. AIKEN. We must be fair to all farmers of the country. If we continue

the use of the parity formula it must be brought up to date so as to be fair to all farmers, and we must maintain a high level of prices for farm products if we are to keep the country on an economically stable basis.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would the Senator be willing to venture a guess as to what it would cost to maintain the level of all agricultural commodities?

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Vermont would not want to venture a guess as to what the prices of anything should be 6 months from now. The Senator from Vermont is convinced that we cannot put the United States at the mercy of any other part of the world in respect to wool until we are sure that we are not going to engage in any future war, and we cannot put our woolen manufacturers at the mercy of any other nation of the world unless we expect them to pay more than they can pay, unless we want to see the domestic woolen industry follow the wool production in its decline.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] on behalf of himself and his colleague [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts on behalf of himself and his colleague.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and read a third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. MORSE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I should like to say that on the voice vote on the passage of the bill I shall vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 814) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide support for wool, and for other purposes."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a very brief statement in regard to the wool bill which was just passed. Early this afternoon when there was a record vote on taking up the bill I was down town on official business in behalf of a constituent and could not be in the Senate Chamber for that vote. I was here, however, when the voice vote was taken on the passage of the bill. I want the Record to show that I voted to pass the bill.

NOMINATIONS TO THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. WHITE obtained the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Before Senators leave the Chamber I should like to make a request for unanimous consent as follows:

I request unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, April 9, at 5 p. m., the Senate go into executive session and proceed to vote, without further debate, upon the questions of the confirmation of the Chairman and the other members appointed to the Atomic Energy Commission, each appointee to be voted upon separately, and in the order in which their names appear on the Executive Calendar; I further ask unanimous consent that immediately thereafter a vote, without debate, be had on the question of the confirmation of the General Manager of the Commission.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request made by the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. CONNALLY. Reserving the right to object, I ask what will be done between now and Wednesday?

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Between now and Wednesday I understand other business can be discussed. This request would fix the exact time for voting. Meanwhile, between now and Wednesday at 5, any Member of the Senate who can obtain the floor and desires to discuss any matters in connection with Mr. Lillenthal or other members nominated to the Atomic Energy Commission can do so. The request requires that a vote in executive session shall be taken at 5 o'clock on Wednesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request submitted by the Senator from Iowa? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AID TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 87, Senate bill 938, the bill to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Maine.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 938) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] may be recognized when the Senate reconvenes tomorrow, in order that he may have charge of and speak on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the senior Senator from Maine? Hearing none, the request is granted.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I merely wish to make it clear that while Senate bill 938 has been made the unfinished business and will be taken up at noon tomorrow, it is my understanding that it may be temporarily laid aside in the course of the day for the consideration of two or three other measures upon which there is expected to be very little controversy, but for which there is

present necessity for action. The first, as I understand, will be House bill 2102, Calendar No. 49, relating to the farm labor supply. It is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] made a request in my behalf in connection with the program for tomorrow. I wish to say that if I can arrange it with the President pro tempore [laughter] I should like to be recognized at noon tomorrow to discuss the Greek and Turkish assistance bill.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Michigan stated that the Greek-Turkish loan measure might be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of one or two other measures. He referred particularly to the farm-labor bill. I wonder if I may ask him what other bills he had in mind.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Commodity Credit Corporation bill, for one.

Mr. WHERRY. Also the resolution of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] providing for an investigation of the appointment of certain postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand that they are matters which will require very little time.

RECESS

Mr. WHITE. I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 8, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 7 (legislative day of March 24), 1947:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Henry F. Grady, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India.

George A. Garrett, of the District of Columbia, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

UNITED STATES CUSTOMS COURT

Hon. Jed Johnson, of Oklahoma, to be judge of the United States Customs Court, vice Hon. William J. Keefe, resigned.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Otto F. Heine, of Hawaii, to be United States marshal for the district of Hawaii. (Mr. Heine is now serving in this post under an appointment which expired June 26, 1946.)

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named candidates for promotions in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service:

SENIOR SURGEON TO BE MEDICAL DIRECTOR

Carl E. Rice

DENTAL SURGEON TO BE TEMPORARY SENIOR DENTAL SURGEON

Norman F. Gerrie

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Alma Coaker, Fruitdale, Ala., in place of L. J. Burnes, retired.

ALASKA

Retha M. Young, Haines, Alaska, in place of A. H. Kingsbury, Jr., resigned.

ARKANSAS

Dwight B. Witherspoon, Hunter, Ark. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.

CALIFORNIA

Ivy A. Dahl, Mokelumne Hill, Calif., in place of F. E. Dahl, deceased.
Grace D. Hyde, Thousand Palms, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.
John A. McConnell, Westley, Calif. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

COLORADO

Floyd R. Duncan, Del Norte, Colo., in place of N. M. Weiss, resigned.

CONNECTICUT

Earle G. Donegan, Windsor, Conn., in place of A. E. Lennox, deceased.

FLORIDA

Robert O. Seaver, Clermont, Fla., in place of F. M. Bowman, resigned.

GEORGIA

Jessie N. Hope, Pembroke, Ga., in place of M. E. Harvey, deceased.

ILLINOIS

James A. Giesler, Cisco, Ill., in place of Marilla Clover, retired.
Donald R. Toberman, Coffeen, Ill., in place of J. H. Whitten, resigned.
John G. Robben, Germantown, Ill., in place of G. H. Henken, deceased.
Gerald L. Hamer, Olivet, Ill., in place of L. J. Willison, resigned.
Lincoln A. Hardcastle, Royalton, Ill., in place of J. S. Browning, deceased.
Francis L. Weghorst, South Pekin, Ill., in place of R. C. Morris, removed.
Herbert M. Bowman, Thompsonville, Ill., in place of A. M. Akin, resigned.

IOWA

Baird Jennings Okey, Dayton, Iowa, in place of K. C. Warner, retired.
Clyde M. Maulsby, Plover, Iowa, in place of M. K. Bruner, resigned.
Marvin O. Larson, Thompson, Iowa, in place of O. J. Johnson, resigned.

KENTUCKY

Lynn R. Rich, Jr., Barlow, Ky., in place of H. R. Tanner, resigned.
Thomas M. Murray, Prospect, Ky., in place of T. H. Skaggs, transferred.

LOUISIANA

Rosa M. Owens, Frierson, La., in place of Rusk Stallcup, retired.

MAINE

Robert M. Dolloff, Brooks, Maine, in place of F. S. Littlefield, transferred.
Emma L. Davis, Hampden, Maine, in place of A. W. Braithwaite, retired.

MARYLAND

Milton T. Holt, Brandywine, Md., in place of S. G. Townshend, Jr., transferred.
Mary R. Schmidt, Eccleston, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.
William E. Spoerlein, Oakland, Md., in place of I. R. Rudy, resigned.
Cornelia W. Hickman, Point of Rocks, Md. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Edward P. Harris, Snow Hill, Md., in place of E. W. Marshall, deceased.

MASSACHUSETTS

Gertrude M. Fallon, North Chelmsford, Mass., in place of J. E. Harrington, resigned.

MICHIGAN

Isabell H. Cumberworth, Rives Junction, Mich., in place of E. M. Southworth, resigned.
John J. McLaughlin, Twin Lake, Mich., in place of W. F. Reddy, removed.

MINNESOTA

Irene Rutter, Kinney, Minn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.

MISSISSIPPI

John Cecil Thead, Crandall, Miss., in place of G. H. Fleming, transferred.
Martha M. Chapman, Friar Point, Miss., in place of T. A. Chapman, deceased.
Hilliard E. Jordan, Kosciusko, Miss., in place of R. S. Burroughs, resigned.
Oliver Theo Fowler, Sweatman, Miss., in place of L. R. Adams, retired.

MISSOURI

Lester F. Bain, Farnfelt, Mo., in place of F. F. Klughart, resigned.
Paul A. Davidson, Ilmo, Mo., in place of C. V. Hollady, resigned.
Floyd J. Strain, Louisburg, Mo., in place of H. W. Atchley, resigned.
Charles N. Bruton, Rosebud, Mo., in place of E. G. Karstedt, retired.
Adrian J. D. Ockerby, Wentworth, Mo., in place of E. F. Gorman, Jr., transferred.
Billie B. Cooper, Windsor, Mo., in place of F. L. Stafford, resigned.

NEVADA

Sue Smith, Fernley, Nev., in place of A. B. Jackson, resigned.

NEW YORK

Frank H. Doyle, Stuyvesant, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.
Anna E. Finkle, West Copake, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.
Foster B. Tice, West Edmeston, N. Y., in place of O. I. Mayne, deceased.
George G. Ferrell, West Point, N. Y., in place of G. L. Harrington, retired.

OHIO

Thomas E. Sexton, Groveport, Ohio, in place of B. L. Peer, removed.
Lester Gerber, Walnut Creek, Ohio. Office became Presidential July 1, 1946.
Paul F. Spillman, Wayneville, Ohio, in place of T. C. Gilroy, transferred.

OREGON

Albert C. Gragg, Salem, Oreg., in place of H. R. Crawford, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Nancy C. Tishue, Addison, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Walter A. Hillsbos, Jr., Oakford, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1944.

SOUTH CAROLINA

William D. Adair, Clinton, S. C., in place of R. L. Plaxico, resigned.

TENNESSEE

Ottis C. Doyle, Jr., McEwen, Tenn., in place of J. W. Fuqua, deceased.
Fred Henry, Maryville, Tenn., in place of M. A. B. Dunn, deceased.
Edgar W. Marshall, Surgoinsville, Tenn. Office became Presidential July 1, 1943.

TEXAS

L. H. Searcy, Stinnett, Tex., in place of W. R. Goodwin, resigned.

UTAH

Louise Y. Monson, Moroni, Utah, in place of F. T. Draper, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Gertrude G. Chinn, Hague, Va., in place of E. B. Chinn, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Charles O. Jackson, Auburn, Wash., in place of A. J. Kralowec, resigned.
Harry S. Burlingham, Redondo, Wash., in place of C. J. Peterson, resigned.
Lavon B. Kelly, Zenith, Wash., in place of L. B. Kelly, resigned.

WEST VIRGINIA

John W. Farris, Capels, W. Va., in place of A. E. Dowdy, resigned.
Lillian M. Brown, Dunlow, W. Va. Office became Presidential July 1, 1945.
Clifton George Bowers, Hollidays Cove, W. Va., in place of J. C. Cameron, deceased.

William A. Johnson, Layland, W. Va., in place of D. H. Beverage, declined.

WISCONSIN

William C. Carroll, Gays Mills, Wis., in place of W. B. Ackerman, deceased.
Edwin L. Saykally, Lake Tomahawk, Wis., in place of R. H. Wirth, deceased.
Ann O. Ball, Tomahawk, Wis., in place of T. J. Kelley, removed.

WYOMING

George P. Hicks, Jr., Casper, Wyo., in place of E. P. Landers, deceased.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 7, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HALLECK.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O King eternal, as we stand in the afterglow of the Eastertide, we praise Thee for Him who is the fulfillment of Thy prophecy of old. We are grateful that the hands which hung upon the cross have opened the gates of Paradise to all believers. Impress us, O God, with His marvelous example of self-surrender and self-sacrifice for the redemption of man. Grant that His wonderful influence may more and more envelop humanity throughout this sad, sad earth.

In the light of His triumph, we pray that we may ever be encouraged with the growing faith that truth is stronger than falsehood and that goodness is destined to live through the ages; though it may seem to be buried in darkness, yet shall it rise again to life immortal.

Let all things seen and unseen their notes in gladness blend,
For Christ the Lord hath risen, our joy that hath no end.

Through Christ our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 3, 1947, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution limiting the application of provisions of Federal law to counsel employed under Senate Resolution 46.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] may address the House for 30 minutes today after the dis-

position of any other special orders and business on the Speaker's desk.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, after the disposition of any other special orders today, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TWYMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the **RECORD** in two instances, in one to include a radio address by Henry J. Taylor and in the other an editorial from the *Washington Times-Herald*.

Mr. STEVENSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the **RECORD** and include an editorial from the *La Crosse Tribune*, of La Crosse, Wis.

Mr. ROBERTSON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the **RECORD** and include an editorial.

ARMY DAY

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago the call to arms came to a generation of Americans that knew not war. The exploits of those veterans of World War I made history. They thought they had fought that war would come no more, only to find that within a generation war had again struck and that again the youth of this Nation went forth.

The exploits of these youngsters, so many thousands of them sons of the veterans of World War I, were typical and followed the great example set by their fathers, exceeding them in many cases—bringing for a second time a glorious victory.

Today in this city a great parade takes place to show to the people of this country and to the earth that the military might of these United States is still great—strength to be used if necessary, though our prayers are that that call will not again come to our youth.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RAMEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in two separate instances, in one to include a letter from Calvin Lieberman on coffee and in the other to include a letter from Virginia Meyer on sugar.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the **RECORD** in two separate instances and to include in each extraneous matter.

Mr. REEVES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the **RECORD** and include a resolution.

Mr. GILLIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the **RECORD** and include an article by Dr. Norman Sweet and an editorial from the *Fort Wayne News-Sentinel*.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the **RECORD** and include a newspaper article by William L. Shirer.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the **RECORD** and include certain correspondence between himself and Mr. Clark, the Attorney General, and Mr. Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, on the subject of communism.

Mr. ELLIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the **RECORD** and include a newspaper article.

Mr. RIZLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the **RECORD** and include a petition on the American Legion of Oklahoma.

THE PHENOMENON OF THE GREEK LOAN

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, the matter presented to us of the so-called Greek loan perhaps presents to the Members of Congress a phenomenon, perhaps an enigma.

An outstanding teacher took his daughter to the pasture field one Sunday afternoon. She did not know what a phenomenon was. She said, "Some say it is this way, some say it is that way; I do not know what it is. What is it, Daddy?"

"I will illustrate it to you, daughter. See that mockingbird over yonder in the tree? That is not a phenomenon; that is natural. See that thistle? That is a weed. That is not a phenomenon; that is natural. See that cow over there mooing? That is natural; that is a cow; that is not a phenomenon. But if that cow should sit on a thistle and sing like a mockingbird, that would be a phenomenon."

Members of Congress have a so-called phenomenon and enigma before them.

They are told by one group, and even some go so far as to testify that should we not make this loan and send troops, Russia will seize the Dardenelles and the Mediterranean and by atomic weapons and otherwise will take us over and there will be world communism. On the other hand, we are told that if we do send troops war is inevitable. There are the middle-of-the-roads who say, "Send money but do not send troops." The enigma or phenomenon is that there is no direct answer to a direct question asked by a Representative of the people. Some in the State Department say, "We do not intend that there be a war," but they do not answer, "There will not be a war if you follow our plan." There are some 6,000 of our bulldozers in Greece and equipment ready for agriculture. If

troops are sent they will not be instructed to teach in agriculture and to till the soil to relieve the food situation, or will the excitement of troops be an impetus to war? No direct question is answered. Folks ask the question, "Why?" Yes, why are there refresher courses now in the Pentagon Building instructing troops—to be sent—in the Greek language and some say in the Turkish language? The answers are not clear. Some say there is practically no instruction; others claim instruction with a meaning. But no direct answer. All Members of Congress are constrained to feel that where there is distress food and instruction in agriculture will be sent if need be. The question is before a vote is taken, "What is imperative?" The representatives of the people, the Members of Congress, will stand up and be counted. They want complete answers before that day. We must answer. They must not be bewildered by a phenomenon or an enigma.

TOLEDO, OHIO.

The Honorable HOMER A. RAMEY,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: My congratulations to you in bringing your message directly to the people you represent: Herein was founded the great faith of the people toward the late President Roosevelt.

You asked for comments on your message: I write you both as an interested citizen and as a friend of your son, Bern. I am a veteran of the last war and a student of history at the University of Toledo. Here are a few conclusions drawn from the scientific pages of history.

One of the original founders of the USSR said any state that was controlled by the military was necessarily a weak state. I am concerned by the growing power of the military in our National Government. What happened after the rule of Marcus Aurelius in the Roman Empire: A century of military anarchy and fall of the state. Why? Simply because the generals took the power invested by the people in their civilian representatives. Can you, sir, as a Congressman, see any connection between these current developments? A growing number of generals and admirals in important civilian governmental positions; the surreptitious Army-Navy merger bill; other Washington legislation granting peculiar power to the services; War Department campaigns promoting one-sided arguments in favor of universal military training; a stepped up War Department program to legislate upon colleagues an ROTC program; the recent resignation of our civilian Secretary of State, Byrnes—and now a new situation in the Balkans, Greece? Is this phenomena merely coincidental? The lessons of history say not.

A word about the Greek crisis. This, as is any international situation, is not a moral question, otherwise UNRRA would not be dead and we would be putting \$400,000,000 into food, seeds, livestock, and clothing for the Greeks. Can the \$400,000,000 we are granting (or proposing to grant) the Greek state earn interest into itself? Can this money earn a profit for the Greek people so that they may from this initial capital establish the industrial production and agriculture required of any state for endurance? Or is this money being, potentially, used to galvanize the nonreproductive element of the Greek Government? What will happen when this primary investment in the Greek military forces has been depleted? Or is our capacity for this sort of contribution unlimited? Again, I think not. And with every gift of this sort the American standard of living is lowered just one more degree.

Now, dear sir, let us do that which many American diplomats seem incapable of doing; let us put ourselves in the Soviet Government's position. Let us face pure fact. President Truman's inspiration to feed, clothe, and arm the Greek Army while the Greek populous is starving is his threat against the expansion of Soviet influence. Now, let us see what makes it possible for this Soviet expansion.

If the economic foundations of a state are weakened, the political foundations of that state will be likewise weakened. No doubt, it was upon this premise that the Soviets came to power in Russia. It is upon this same premise that the Soviet control will either expand or contract in the future.

Very well, by President Truman's unsubtle undeclared war against the Soviets he is, in effect, saying we will send ever more and more millions of dollars and military advisors to any state anywhere which deems itself to be in fear of potential Soviet influence. In this roll, upon which we are about to cast ourselves, the potentialities are boundless, the probabilities disastrous. If the Soviet Government deems it necessary to counter our move, her reciprocity, I am sure, would be justified.

Perhaps a bit of speculation would now be in order. What would prevent the Soviets from creating other situations in a number of the other various states in Europe and the middle east? Other European and Asiatic countries, having observed our commitments to Greece, would cry out for similar aid. Thereafter military power in all the states concerned would grow incessantly more powerful, while the economic structure of the states concerned, ourselves included, would grow incessantly weaker. By simple logic, if the economic foundations of any state are weakened, it is potentially vulnerable to Soviet ideas. Ironically enough, President Truman's plan to save the world from Soviet domination might well lead the world to Soviet subjugation.

Finally, what of the UN's position in this whole matter? Why did not Greece appeal to the UN for financial aid from the world bank? Could it be possible that certain factions in our Government advised Greece not to appeal to the UN? Certainly we are not to believe the weak excuses forwarded to the effect that a quicker decision is needed here than the UN could give. Undoubtedly our action has been in presumptuous violation of the UN, and definitely contemptuous of its ardent founder, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

I feel certain that if the power of the military in the United States is not checked—and checked soon—we will have taken the irreparable, unretractable steps toward atomic war.

Your message, to which I referred in my first paragraph, was your radio address of Saturday, March 15, transcribed via station WTOL. In closing, may I ask what your definite views are in regard to these topics I have mentioned?

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. TULLER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

REGIMENTATION AND HITLERIAN CONTROL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the believers in a planned economy are making

a last ditch struggle for a chance to rule and ruin America.

The people of America are fed up with regimentation and Hitleristic controls. I wish to cite an example of such. An operator of a farmers' store in a county seat in Nebraska deposited sugar-ration stamps in a local bank in the amount of 800 pounds. The bank erroneously gave him credit for 80,000 pounds. The OPA never discovered the error, but the grocer did. He promptly returned the stamps for 79,200 pounds of sugar.

Thereafter, the OPA charged this same grocer with some trivial and unimportant errors in connection with his sugar stamps. His right to sell sugar was taken away for 60 days. At the end of that time he was required to get the consent of the OPA to resume the sale of sugar. He was informed that that consent could only be had by securing enough sugar to balance his stamp account. The OPA ought to know that the only way this merchant can get sugar to make up for a technical error is to buy it on the black market at \$31 or more per hundred.

Mr. Speaker, is it the objective of the OPA to force this man into the black market, or is it their objective to force him out of business altogether?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEVITT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include an editorial from the Washington Post.

A CHARTER FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVITT. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the Eightieth Congress convened, we new Members were feted by the Washington Board of Trade. It was there that I first learned of my importance as 1 of 531 members of the Town Council of the City of Washington. I appreciate this high honor and will exercise my utmost to properly discharge the duties of the office, but it seems to me that, as Members of the Congress of the United States, we have so many pressing problems, national and international in scope, that we should concentrate our abilities on their solution rather than to dissipate our time and energies with purely municipal problems.

When such matters as the Greco-Turkish loan cry out to the Congress for speedy solution, why should our time be taken up with determining the feasibility of constructing an underpass at Dupont Circle? When the great tasks of reducing taxes, balancing the budget, and paying off the national debt hold first place on our agenda, why should Members of this body spend hours of their time hearing testimony concerning a bill regulating the possession of firearms in the District of Columbia? We spent almost a full legislative day last month deciding that the milk cows of the Midwest would not properly function if the citizens of

the District of Columbia operated on daylight-saving time. Soon again we must decide the same issue. I voted for daylight-saving time before, and I shall vote for it again, but my point is that we should not be dissipating our precious time on matters of purely local concern when our big job is to legislate on national and international problems.

This Congress should grant the District of Columbia a charter providing for a legislative body of its own, which would have more time, more inclination, and a better knowledge of local problems with which to legislate for the good of the District. I urge that such action be taken by the Congress.

COMMUNISM—PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S ADDRESS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a speech made by President Truman on last Saturday night.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we have come to a show-down between atheistic communism and Christian civilization; between oriental sovietism and the western way of life; between treason in the United States and American patriotism.

A leader of one of the great veterans' organizations said the other day that he regarded Joe Stalin as the Genghis Khan of the twentieth century. The battle we are in now is just as serious as that which confronted Europe during the terrible days when Genghis Khan and his ruthless hordes threatened the civilization of mankind.

Every Communist newspaper in America, every Communist speaker in America, is maligning and abusing President Truman because of his attitude on this proposition. They fear he is blocking their treasonable attempts to get control of this country.

Whether you propose to go along with President Truman all the way or not, the time has come when America—when the American people—must know that the most dangerous and insidious influence that ever crept into this country is this oriental communism that is plotting our destruction.

You might as well attempt to pet a rattlesnake or tame a hyena as to try to make peace with communism.

Nothing that a Communist says can be relied upon, and no agreement one would sign would be worth the paper it is written on.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I am inserting the address of President Truman which I trust every one of you will read and study carefully.

The matter referred to follows:

TEXT OF TRUMAN'S SPEECH AT JEFFERSON DAY DINNER

My fellow Democrats, our meeting together this evening carries forward an old party custom. In this annual tribute to the memory of Thomas Jefferson, we, who are members of the party he founded—the Democratic Party—take great pride and feel deep satisfaction.

We know that as long as we remain free, the spirit of Thomas Jefferson lives in America. His spirit is the spirit of freedom. We are heartened by the knowledge that the light he kindled a century and a half ago shines today, in the United States. It shines even more strongly and steadily than in his time. What was then an untried faith is now a living reality.

But we know that no class, no party, no nation, has a monopoly on Jefferson's principles. Out of the silence of oppressed peoples, out of despair of those who have lost freedom, there comes to us an expression of longing. Repeated again and again, in many tongues, from many directions, it is a plea of men, women, and children for the freedom that Thomas Jefferson proclaimed as an inalienable right.

When we hear the cry for freedom arising from shores beyond our own, we can take heart from the words of Thomas Jefferson. In his letter to President Monroe, urging the adoption of what we now know as the Monroe Doctrine, he wrote:

"Nor is the occasion to be slighted which this proposition offers of declaring our protest against the atrocious violations of the rights of nations by the interference of any one in the internal affairs of another."

MUST MAKE PROTEST EFFECTIVE

We, like Jefferson, have witnessed atrocious violations of the rights of nations.

We, too, have regarded them as occasions not to be slighted.

We, too, have declared our protest.

We must make that protest effective by aiding those peoples whose freedoms are endangered by foreign pressures.

We must take a positive stand. It is no longer enough merely to say "We don't want war." We must act in time—ahead of time—to stamp out the smoldering beginnings of any conflict that may threaten to spread over the world.

We know how the fire starts. We have seen it before—aggression by the strong against the weak, openly by the use of armed force and secretly by infiltration. We know how the fire spreads. And we know how it ends.

Let us not underestimate the task before us. The burden of our responsibility today is greater, even considering the size and resources of our expanded Nation, than it was in the time of Jefferson and Monroe. For the peril to man's freedom that existed then exists now on a much smaller earth—an earth whose broad oceans have shrunk and whose natural protections have been taken away by new weapons of destruction.

What is the responsibility that we must assume?

EDIFICE OF LASTING PEACE

Our responsibility is to stand guard before the edifice of lasting peace which, after so long a time, is at last being built.

That edifice is the United Nations.

The function of the United Nations is to quench the flames wherever they may break out; to watch throughout the world and extinguish every spark that comes from a difference between governments; to do this, if possible, through the machinery of peaceful arbitration, but to do it in any case. This is so, even if armed conflict must be prevented by the use of an international police force.

We believe that formula is sound and workable. Our faith in it is strong and resolute. The United Nations is man's hope of putting out, and keeping out, the fires of war for all time. In supporting the United Nations we must, when necessary, supplement its activities. By aiding free nations to maintain their freedom we strengthen the United Nations in the performance of its functions.

The foreign policy of this country transcends in importance any other question confronting us. It would be fatal if it were

to become the subject of narrow political consideration.

Our foreign policy must not be wrecked on the rocks of partisanship.

United support of a policy that serves the interests of the Nation as a whole must be our aim.

BIPARTISAN EFFORT PRAISED

I wish to commend the efforts of those members of both parties who have worked, side by side, to achieve this goal.

To meet the responsibilities placed upon us today this Nation must be strong. A strong United States means a country that maintains a military power commensurate with its responsibilities. It means a country of sound domestic economy. It means a country that holds its place in the forefront of industrial production and continues its leadership in creating the techniques of abundance. And it means, most of all, a strong, united, confident people, clear in the knowledge of their country's destiny, unshaken and unshakable in their resolve to live in a world of free peoples at peace.

No matter how great our military potential may be, military potential alone is not enough. It is necessary that we maintain sufficient military strength to convince the world that we intend to meet our responsibilities.

Now, what of our domestic economy? How strong are we at home?

As we appraise our domestic scene—our mighty array of factories, mines, farms, producing at or near capacity, and with employment at an all-time high—our doubts, if we had any, are put to rest. We are viewing a panorama of prosperity—such prosperity as no generation of Americans before us ever experienced.

CALAMITY PREDICTIONS WRONG

You may recall hearing dire predictions, in the last year and a half—predictions that the United States was heading into an economic crack-up, predictions of glutted markets, of a great deflationary plunge. It is significant that the most pessimistic cries of calamity came from men who had little confidence in our American system of free enterprise.

They were wrong in their predictions. They were wrong because they do not understand the strength of our system of free competitive enterprise. Under that system, each man is free to go where he likes, to follow the calling of his choice, and to be rewarded in proportion to the productivity of the effort or the property he contributes. Insofar as we insure that each individual has the opportunity and inducement to make the largest contribution he can to this country's total production, we not only strengthen our Nation against any possible encroachments, but we also set an example to all other peoples of the desirability of free government in the economic as well as the political sense.

Our country's financial stamina was tested in the recent war as it had never been tested before. But in spite of the tremendous cost of the war, we emerged with our financial leadership in the economic world greater than ever before. Beyond making our best effort to eliminate waste in the conduct of the war, the cost of the war was not a matter within our power to control. We emerged bearing a burden of debt, representing that cost, and what we do with that burden is a question of tremendous import, but fortunately it is a question that we have the power to decide for ourselves.

The first decision that we made was to reduce Federal Government spending as quickly as possible.

The extent of retrenchments by the Government is shown by the record.

PROGRESS AGAINST DEFICITS

In the fiscal year 1945 the Federal Government spent \$100,000,000,000. In 1946 we cut expenditures to \$64,000,000,000. In 1947

we have further reduced expenditures to an estimated figure of \$42,000,000,000. The budget for the next fiscal year, which I have sent to the Congress, totals \$37,500,000,000.

Not only have we greatly reduced expenditures, but we have made tremendous progress toward the elimination of deficits.

In the fiscal year 1945, the Federal Government had a deficit of over \$53,000,000,000. In the fiscal year 1946 it was in the red by about \$21,000,000,000. But now we have worked our way into the black, and I am happy to be able to say tonight that for the present fiscal year 1947 we shall balance the budget and we shall have a surplus.

I am determined that stringent economy shall govern all peacetime operations of the Government.

When the several departments and agencies were called upon, a few months ago, to submit their requests for funds for the coming fiscal year, they were told of my determination.

They responded by eliminating many of their former activities. This was not enough. When the estimates were in, I went over them, making further substantial reductions. When I finished, these department estimates had been reduced by a total of some \$7,000,000,000 under their original level.

SACRIFICES REQUIRED

I was warned by some that I was going too far. I was aware of the risk. But I was aware, too, of the greater risk of a weakened postwar financial structure. I knew that in the public interest, sacrifices of some Government services had to be made.

The result was a budget of \$37,500,000,000. That figure marked the border line beyond which we could not reduce the activities of our Government without entering the area of false economy. In other words, further so-called economies would not have been economies at all. They would merely have meant curtailment of services that would cost our taxpayers—all taxpayers—more than the reduction in cost that appeared on the surface.

You, my fellow citizens, are properly cautious of false economy in your daily lives. If the foundation of your house needs repair, or if the roof leaks, you know that you are wasting money, not saving it, by failing to make that repair.

So with Government. If we abandon our work of reclamation, of soil conservation, of preserving our forests, of developing our water resources, we are wasting money, not saving it. If we cease our vigilance along the borders of our country and at our ports of entry, we are wasting money, not saving it. If we falsely economize by reducing the staff of men and women who audit tax returns, or who increase the country's productivity by settling labor disputes, we are wasting money, not saving it. If we cut down the effectiveness of our armed forces, we run the risk of wasting both money and lives.

Any substantial reduction of the 1948 Federal budget, as submitted to the Congress, must be clearly understood by the American people as a venture into false economy. To the extent that we countenance any such reduction, we shall weaken our own house by our refusal to keep it in basic repair. At best, this is poor judgment. At worst, it is an invitation to disaster.

PROBLEM OF PUBLIC DEBT

The second decision we must make, affecting the strength and health of our economy, concerns the public debt. We must resolve to begin the long process of reducing that debt, which represents a large part of the cost of winning World War II. That debt amounts to almost \$2,000 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

In deciding whether we shall start substantial payment on the debt, or whether we shall reduce taxes instead, we are deciding a question which will affect the future of

every one of us. Our decision will affect the number of jobs in the future, the wages men and women will earn, what those wages will buy, and how much our savings, our insurance, and our bonds will be worth.

We, as a nation, are now having prosperous years. This is the time when we must start paying off the debt in earnest. When a man is earning good wages, and at the same time owes a lot of money, he is wise if he uses his excess income to pay off his debts. He would be short-sighted if he cut his income just because he was not spending it all at the moment. When the people, through their Government owe a lot of money—as we do today—it is the course of wisdom to make payment on our debt. It would be extremely short-sighted to cut down the Federal revenue without making a real effort toward debt reduction.

I recognize, frankly, that the present burden of taxation on our people is too heavy to be considered as permanent, and at a proper time I will support tax reduction and tax readjustment designed to reduce the burden and to adjust that burden to the needs of a peacetime economy.

CONCERNED OVER PRICE LEVEL

In further evaluating the strength of our domestic economy, I must express to you my deep concern over the level of prices prevailing today. A system of free enterprise does not automatically work out its own adjustments without our giving thought to the process.

The main factor that can weaken our economy at this time is our own selfishness—the kind of selfishness which is now expressed in the form of unnecessarily high prices for many commodities and for many manufactured articles. These prices must be brought down if our entire economy is not to suffer.

With the exception of a very few items, all price controls have been removed. But freedom from such controls, like other freedoms, cannot be abused with impunity. A profound moral responsibility rests upon those citizens whose decisions have widespread effect on our markets—to put it simply, the responsibility of playing fair, of not going whole hog for profits. The alternative is inflation, industry priced out of the market, and eventually, men priced out of their jobs.

The world today looks to us for leadership.

The force of events make it necessary that we assume that role.

This is a critical period of our national life. The process of adapting ourselves to the new concept of our world responsibility is naturally a difficult and painful one. The cost is necessarily great.

NOT OUR NATURE TO SHIRK

But it is not our nature to shirk our obligations. We have a heritage that constitutes the greatest resource of this Nation. I call it the spirit and character of the American people.

We are the people who gave to the world George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt.

We are a people who not only cherish freedom and defend it, if need be with our lives, but who also recognize the right of other men and other nations to share it.

While the struggle for the rights of man goes forward in other parts of the world, the free people of America cannot look on with easy detachment, with indifference to the outcome.

In our effort to make permanent the peace of the world, we have much to preserve—much to improve—and much to pioneer.

As we strive to reach the fulfillment of our quest we will do well to recall the words of Thomas Jefferson:

"I have sworn, upon the altar of God, eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

MAJ. JAMES G. HORRELL AGAINST ALEXANDER AKERMAN, JR.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon the Legislature of the State of Florida will meet in its usual biennial session. At that time there will be a contest over one of the seats for representative from Orlando, Orange County, Fla.

Mr. Carroll Reece, chairman of the Republican National Committee, has injected himself into this contest without knowing the facts in the case.

In the State of Florida, where there are more than one representative from a county, they run in groups in the primaries. Orange County has two representatives. Therefore they have one from group 1 and one from group 2. The contest in this case will be between the Democrat, Maj. James G. Horrell, a former representative in the legislature from Orange County, and the Republican, Alexander Akerman, Jr., of Winter Park, a suburb of Orlando. The contest arises over the fact that Major Horrell in the Democratic primaries qualified in group 1 and Mr. Akerman qualified in the Republican primaries in group 2. Major Horrell had no opposition in the Democratic primary and so far as the public knew very little in the general election. Mr. Leland Chubb qualified against Major Horrell and Major Horrell defeated him by a big majority.

Mr. Akerman on occasion informed Major Horrell that he qualified in group 2 to avoid opposing him, according to Major Horrell's statement, and I, being present during the primaries and the general election campaign, recall distinctly in the general election campaign that Mr. Akerman continually referred to the Democratic nominee in group 2 as his opponent, appearing on the same platform with him at the junior chamber of commerce, whereas he never in any way indicated in his campaign that he was opposing Major Horrell. Major Horrell and Mr. Chubb appeared on the same platform together at the junior chamber of commerce.

The fact emerges that shortly before the election Mr. Akerman did tell Major Horrell that he felt that the two men receiving the highest votes would be the representatives, regardless of groupings—this all after he had given the public the impression that he considered himself the opponent only of Mr. Cobb, the Democratic nominee, and not the opponent of Major Horrell. At no time was it publicized that Mr. Akerman was opposing Major Horrell and of course Major Horrell's friends, realizing that he had no opposition in Mr. Chubb, did not give him the high vote that he would have received had Mr. Akerman declared that he was opposing Major Horrell and Mr. Cobb.

I venture to say without any fear of contradiction that had Mr. Akerman from the beginning declared that he was

opposing both Democratic nominees, Major Horrell would have defeated him by a splendid majority. Mr. Cobb did defeat him but owing to the deceptive campaign that Mr. Akerman carried on he got a higher vote than Major Horrell.

Mr. Carroll Reece injects himself into the contest by wiring Mr. Akerman and in his wire he implies a threat against the Florida Legislature of retaliation in States where the Republicans control the legislature if the Florida Legislature fails to seat Mr. Akerman. He injects himself into the contest by saying of the contest, and I quote:

I am further informed that the contestant—

Maj. James G. Horrell—

in this case is attempting to induce the Democratic majority in the legislature to refuse to seat you under provision in the Florida Constitution providing: "That each House is the judge of the qualifications, elections and returns of its own members."

Mr. Reece also says, and I quote:

This would appear to me to be an attempt to induce the legislature to refuse to seat a duly elected member on the sole ground that he belongs to a party other than that represented by a majority of the legislature.

This is a most asinine statement. Major Horrell's brief distributed to the members of the legislature indicates no such attempt.

I have heard of no general move to seat Major Horrell instead of Mr. Akerman, a Republican. But if there were such a move, it is an insult to the intelligence of the members of the legislature to assume that they would attempt to disqualify Mr. Akerman for any such stupid reason. We have had a Republican in the legislature once before, and he was not disqualified. Mr. Reece goes further and makes himself offensive to any intelligent individual when he implies his threat of retaliation in the Republican-controlled legislatures if the Florida Legislature refuses to seat Mr. Akerman. In his telegram referring to the contest he says this would "of course be an obvious invitation to the other party to adopt retaliatory measures elsewhere." He also says:

If that same principle were applied in Washington, for example, the Republican majority in the House of Representatives could have refused to seat all Democrats elected last November, including the six Democratic Representatives from Florida.

I might remind Mr. Reece that it was just such interference by the carpetbaggers in the affairs of the Southern States which has made it possible for the Democratic Party to control these States continuously since the carpetbag days.

I may also remind Mr. Reece that in no State outside of the South has one party controlled the State continuously for that long. I would also like to remind him if his implied suggestion of retaliation had been adopted earlier, there would have been no Republican in Congress for the last 16 years. Mr. Reece's implied suggestion would set a most dangerous precedent for his own party and one which would lead only to chaos.

High officials in the Democratic Party would take no part or interfere in any way in this contest in the State legisla-

ture, and I would suggest that Mr. Reece keep out of it also.

When the Legislature of the State of Florida decides this contest between the Republican, Mr. Akerman, and the Democrat, Major Horrell, they will decide it on reasonable grounds, and if I know the people of Florida, which I think I do, being a native of that State, they will decide the contest without any suggestion or without any advice, interference, or meddling of Mr. Carroll Reece, chairman of the Republican National Committee.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOLGER (at the request of Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include articles appearing in the United States News and the Washington Post.

Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted by the Oklahoma Legislature memorializing Congress to extend the REA program.

Mr. MONRONEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include clippings from the New York Times regarding the earnings of 2,900 corporations for the past year.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address he delivered.

Mr. REED of New York (at the request of Mr. MICHENER) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD on H. R. 1 and include tables from the committee hearings.

Mr. WELCH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include Assembly Joint Resolution 33 of the California State Legislature with reference to an application of the State of California to Congress for repossession and control over certain rights-of-way concerning the Golden Gate Bridge and highway district.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] has heretofore been granted permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a manuscript entitled "The Forces Patterning Tomorrow's Economic Life." It is found that the manuscript exceeds a little over the two pages allowed in the amount of \$193.75, but I ask unanimous consent that the manuscript be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, from many parts of the country come reports of heavy flood damage. Rains of extremely heavy proportions and alarm-

ing flood waters are sweeping parts of the Midwest, inundating towns and villages and causing loss of life and heavy property damage. From Michigan comes the word of all-time record floods. The appeal to help is with us now and will bring angry demands if this Congress is deaf to flood suffering and privation.

In the face of these ominous warnings from the Midwest, I hear disturbing reports that our own Appropriations Committee, headed by the distinguished gentleman from New York, is considering the omitting of funds which might be used in preventing such catastrophes and in bringing relief to the suffering of our own people. I hope Republican economy will not go so far as to deny the help to our own people which we freely give to other peoples of the world. I hope when the Appropriations Committee gets together on this matter, it will not stint or engage in false economy when it comes to flood control and the proper handling of the water resources of this Nation.

AMERICANISM

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the greatest privilege any man can possibly enjoy is to be an American. This privilege was given us all by our founding fathers when they wrote the Constitution.

Today Americanism is being challenged, not only here, but in many places throughout the world. Other isms are defying and defiling our conception of government and flaunting the sacred folds of our American flag.

The call to stand fast against the forces which would destroy our country has been sounded by the President and other national leaders. They would have us adopt a strong policy of striking back at the enemies of representative government.

Today a token force, symbolic of armed preparedness, will march up Constitution Avenue and around the Capitol. This will not be as impressive as in war years. There will not be the great numbers of men or mobile weapons.

All of which brings us to ask ourselves how well equipped are we to back up the demands our State Department is making in international councils? Will we be called upon to defend the diplomatic positions we are taking on far-flung territory and issues on every continent and ocean?

We must preserve Americanism at all costs. It is our definition of freedom and liberty, and we believe is our greatest hope today in a troubled and perplexed world.

But if we expect to preserve this way of life, we must be able to answer the question I just asked. How well prepared are we, and how does our power compare with other great powers, some of whom may not see eye to eye with us on the subject of Americanism. We owe it to

the Americans we represent to keep this Nation strong so that we may all be secure and our future starry and bright.

BUILDING CONSTRUCTION

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have received a very large number of strong protests from many organizations and officials of my district against orders of the Federal Government, issued through the CPA and FHA and other bureaus, to cease construction. These protests are signed by prominent and influential men of my community. Something must be done about it. I quote from a letter signed by the town fathers of the grand old town of Brewster:

We suggest that you either throw them out, kick them out, or vote them out.

I wish I could.

ATTENTION: APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—A SAMPLE OF GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, the following news article which appeared last week in my hometown paper, is a good illustration of the rush on the part of bureaucrats to spend public funds and to make commitments for future expenditures by increasing Federal pay rolls. I hope the Appropriations Committee will investigate.

[From the Red Wing Republican Eagle, Red Wing, Minn.]

SEEK ENGINEERS

Five hundred and fifty civil, electrical, and mechanical engineers are needed immediately by the Bureau of Reclamation at Denver, Colo., to design dams, canals, power plants, and other engineering features for the development of irrigation works and power facilities in the 17 western States. The local office of State Employment Service is participating in the campaign to secure professional men, who will receive from \$3,397 to \$4,902 per year.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Nebraska) was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a recent address he delivered before the Vermont Legislature.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

LABOR LEGISLATION

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I have been receiving a number of letters registering protest about the fact that labor legislation has not been passed by Congress. May I comment, in the hope that Members will take note of this, as it might aid them in the future, that for 3 weeks we went through our period of reorganization. Then for a week the Committee on Education and Labor met and considered their plans. For 6 weeks they listened to the testimony of 137 persons from all over the Nation, including representatives of labor, management, and the public at large, and heard 2,000,000 words of testimony in addition to the exhibits that were introduced in evidence. Following that, for 1 week, the subcommittee went to various parts of the Nation to take up questions that were involved in those particular localities. For 2 weeks we have now been drafting a labor bill that we believe will reach this House next week. I think when we consider the fact that we have done this while still in a state of war, trying to write a labor bill for peacetime, to overcome the effects of 14 years of hurried legislation, we are doing the best that we possibly can for the people of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE CONFERENCE

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, our Under Secretary of State, Mr. William L. Clayton, accompanied by a staff of assistants, advisers, specialists, and so forth, leaves tomorrow for Geneva, Switzerland, to attend an international trade conference. Mr. Clayton and his assistants propose to do two things at this conference: First, negotiate reciprocal trade agreements with 18 other nations, and, second, to set up and establish an International Trade Organization as a department or branch of the United Nations organization, said International Trade Organization to have the power and authority to regulate, supervise, and control world trade. Our people are entitled to know what this Geneva conference proposes to do, what its objectives are, and what those objectives will mean in the economic life of this Nation if the International Trade Organization becomes operative in the future. I have, therefore, asked for this time in order to discuss the situation that confronts us today in connection with this Geneva conference, and to point out the possibilities and powers of this proposed International Trade Organization.

In order to get the proper perspective for this discussion, and in order to forecast the problematical outcome of the international economic poker game that we are to sit in at Geneva during the next few months, we should first review

the results of other international poker games in which our State Department took part, with Uncle Sam furnishing the chips. I propose to review the past record of the State Department in these international poker games by asking a series of questions—a series of questions I was prevented from asking Mr. Clayton at a recent hearing of the Ways and Means Committee because a point of order was made against the questions. I now ask them from this floor, directing my questions to Mr. Clayton, to the Congress, and to the people of this Nation.

Question No. I: In the pre-Pearl Harbor days was the State Department either wise or right when it protested against proposed legislation to place an embargo upon shipments of scrap iron, high-octane gasoline, airplane parts, and other war material to Japan?

Question No. II: Was the State Department right when it advised President Roosevelt at Teheran and Yalta to give in to Russia, to carry on a program of appeasement, and to forget or ignore the Atlantic Charter in connection with Stalin's ambitions in Poland, in Germany, in the Baltic nations, and in Manchuria?

Question No. III: Was the State Department right when it agreed to and approved the so-called Morgenthau economic plan for postwar Germany, a plan that was both unsound and unworkable, a plan that if carried out would have wrecked the economic life of the whole of Europe?

Question No. IV: Was the State Department right when it consented to and approved the four-zone-divided-authority plan for occupied Germany, a plan that has proved a failure in every sense of the word, a plan that has become a tremendous handicap to the recovery of both Germany and Europe, a plan that is costing and will continue to cost Uncle Sam untold millions of dollars?

Question No. V: Was the State Department either wise or farseeing when it failed to urge—yes, even demand—that Joe Stalin be required to sign on the dotted line concerning his attitude and intentions toward Poland, Greece, Turkey, Iraq, Iran, and Manchuria before we turned over the \$11,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease war materials that enabled him to withstand the assaults of Hitler's battalions at Stalingrad and other points? Are we not now placed in the position of trying to lock the door after the horse is stolen?

Question No. VI: Was the State Department either wise or farseeing when it failed to advise—yes, even demand—that Great Britain sign on the dotted line concerning present unsettled, troublesome, vexing world questions before we turned over to her the \$30,000,000,000 worth of lend-lease war supplies? Is this not another case of hindsight being better than foresight?

Mr. Speaker, time and subsequent events prove that there can be only one answer to each of these six questions—and that answer is "No." In view of this summary of past events showing that our State Department failed woefully in its dealings with foreign powers, can we today be optimistic over the outcome of the international economic poker game about to start at Geneva? I

say Uncle Sam will in all probability lose his economic shirt.

Mr. Speaker, our American economic system has brought us to the highest plane of industrial achievement of any people on earth. It has given the American laborer a wage unequaled anywhere on the face of the globe. It has helped us conduct successfully two world wars in the short span of 25 years—neither of them of our making; and it has enabled us to feed and finance nearly every country in the world. The keystone of our economic system—at least until the advent of the New Deal—was our protective tariff. Today a new program is about to be formulated that will destroy this keystone of American prosperity and success. At the Geneva Conference our State Department proposes to negotiate trade agreements with 18 foreign countries as a prerequisite to the establishment of an International Trade Organization, which—so the State Department claims—is essential in order to bring about international cooperation, and to promote world peace. The State Department intends these negotiations to be a part of a larger plan of world economic cooperation, stemming from the Atlantic Charter. The plan calls for our participation in world currency stabilization, world banking, and other world economic, food, and social councils.

The proposed International Trade Organization has a very wide and dangerous significance. It embraces the intricate maneuverings of international-trade domination and world finance. It is essentially a scheme for America to finance the whole world. I consider it a scheme to lower our American tariff barriers, to regulate our domestic employment, and to reduce the wage scale of our American productive system—a scheme that would drag American wages, working conditions, living levels, and liberties down to the levels prevalent in Europe and in the Orient. The puzzling thing about all this is the disquieting fact that the scheme has been devised, not by foreigners, but by planners in our own State Department.

Mr. Speaker, this International Trade Organization, in effect, would be an international super state. It would take away from the American people control of American production. It would be within the power of this international super state to say what American agricultural surpluses, or manufactured goods, or both, might be exported, and how much foreign goods could be imported into the United States. Of course, our State Department theorists do not tell us that this super state would be established at the expense of our American standard of living and our American wage scale.

Originally, the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was intended to expand our foreign trade, and to secure advantageous concessions from other nations. It never was intended to inflict grave—perhaps fatal—injury upon our own domestic industry and agriculture. The act gave the President the power to negotiate tariff agreements with foreign governments without Senate approval. He was empowered to adjust tariff rates either upward or downward. However,

since the inception of the act, 12 years ago, never once has one single rate been increased. The act was intended to relieve unemployment in this country. It is quite obvious, however, that it did not alleviate unemployment in this country during the time it was operative, between 1934 and the start of the war in 1941.

Mr. Speaker, if a planned world economy is once established and given over to an international authority, a planned national economy will be inevitable. In view of this fact, I ask: How can we soon forget the bitter fruits of our New Deal planners? Only a short while back they experimented for us, and on us, upon a national scale, and they almost ruined us. Today we have the most crushing tax burden and the most monumental debt in history. They now want to broaden the scope of their experimentation to an international scale even if it means the sacrifice of our American way of life. World planning entails national planning. Our State Department visionaries now hope to force national planning through the medium of international planning, with world trade as a starting point.

Mr. Speaker, America today remains the only surviving democracy among the great nations of the world. In the chaos of present-day world trade, we alone remain the bulwark of free enterprise. Can free enterprise as we know it today live alongside and compete with the socialistic set-up of the British Empire? Can it live alongside and compete with the Russian plan of economic totalitarianism? Those questions await an answer.

To adopt the proposals advocated by our State Department for an International Trade Organization would mean to transfer our governmental powers to a world economic authority. If the proposals are adopted, we shall be hard hit in our daily lives, even to the point of being no longer free to do as we would with our own possessions; no longer free to act upon our own problems in our own way. The plan, if put into operation, would completely destroy what is left of our system of tariff protection. Already present agreements are listed with 27 foreign governments and cover about two-thirds of the United States foreign trade, which this year may reach \$11,000,000,000 in exports and \$6,000,000,000 in imports. In numerous cases tariff reductions of 40 or 50 percent have already been made during the past 12 years. And it is now proposed further to reduce the rates even on these items by a substantial amount up to 50 percent of what protection is left.

Mr. Speaker, in a planned world, free American enterprise could no longer exist. Look at the Orient after five or six thousand years. Look at Europe after more than a thousand years. Then look at America after a hundred and sixty years. Compare the progress—the conditions—and take your choice.

We must halt this vicious plan for an International Trade Organization before it goes too far or it will be the undoing of everything that we have built up and developed under our Constitution. By reducing the tariffs we would be destroy-

ing the very heart of our American domestic economy. The idea of international participation at the expense of our own welfare is an idea repugnant to American tradition. It is wholly hostile to American ideals and accomplishments. It is a move to absorb our free economic system into an international scheme of experimentation which has yet to prove it has anything better to offer us than the bitter fruits of the New Deal planned-economy scheme which proved so disastrous.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a plan, but a plot to destroy the American way of life. It is a plot designed to force us to share the poverty of the world through curtailment of American production and trade, commerce, and agriculture at the order of the International Trade Organization. It is inconceivable to me that the American people would ever knowingly permit American production to be placed under the control of an international organization. Why should the one Nation in which free enterprise still lives lead the movement to create a planned world economy which is utterly hostile to the philosophy of free enterprise? Why should the United States give in to other nations who favor world participation only because they fear American competition—if free enterprise survives in this country?

Mr. Speaker, we must unwrap and examine carefully this Pandora box of international control which the State Department has taken the pains to wrap up for us in so much secrecy. Let us study its contents before we turn them loose upon the world, lest they prove an economic atom bomb of destruction to our free democratic form of government.

The all-important question to be settled at Geneva is, Shall the United States surrender control of its tariff completely; shall it give up the regulation of its own trade, industrial production, labor, and agriculture, to an international organization that does not care a rap for Uncle Sam? The economic pattern for the world of the future depends upon the answer to that question.

Mr. CLEVELER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Ohio.

Mr. CLEVELER. I hope the gentleman will bear with me for a minute or so.

We have now before the Committee on Agriculture of the House a perfect example of the results of this reciprocal-trade program. I speak of wool.

We have two crops of American clip and a third one coming up, and we are unable to sell it.

We have one law that requires that a farm product may not be sold at less than the parity price yet we have the most perfect tariff law in the world, an elastic one with an escalator clause that works both ways. As we sit in this committee our Democratic friends are in a quandary. They have got their feet all tangled up and their eyes dim with the mist of the halo that has been around the head of Cordell Hull for so many years. They do not know where they are going. They want to charge it up as a war casualty.

As a matter of fact the wool trade is going out of business in this country. It is only 31 percent. This problem is a postwar problem. They want to solve it by going to the Treasury of the United States and bailing out the American wool grower, yet today we have all the legislation necessary to raise the price of clean wool 17 cents a pound, 8½ cents a pound on grease wool, and wool as it comes off the sheep 4 cents a pound. If that is still not enough to save the American wool grower we can raise it another 4 cents.

I am intrigued this morning by this talk on communism.

It seems to me that during the time I have been down here our Presidents do not know any good Democrats. Whenever an appointment is made, they find an ardent left-winger or one of these one-world do-gooders or a fellow traveler. Whenever an appointment is made on a board, even involving the safety of the world, they do that. They are always good to us when they reach into this Pandora's box and bring out one of these emergencies to put us on the spot. They give us an alternative, however. We may take this or chaos. We always have the choice.

I want to remind my Democratic friends that you cannot lie down with the dogs and not get up with fleas, you cannot play with these Communists and left wingers, and you and I have met them in every election, then suddenly wish them off. When they are still under your tent you are playing ball with them. It is about time that we discovered there are old-fashioned Democrats that some of these appointments might be given to, men whom we could believe in, men who have the interest of their country at heart.

Mr. MASON. I say that the New Deal domestic planned economy brought chaos to us and now the planned international economy will bring chaos to the world involving us.

Mr. CLEVELER. May I say something else?

Mr. MASON. Yes; go ahead.

Mr. CLEVELER. According to the Agriculture Department, one of the greatest shortages is in connection with fats and oils in the last week of this month that we have ever seen. There is a shortage of lard and all cooking fats we use. It is because of a board in which one American sits down with 43 foreigners. The Chairman is a Belgian. That board allots this oil that belongs to Americans to the people all over the world. It is time that somebody rub a little Americanism on this party that rules the other end of the Avenue in order to get them to think America and work for America and protect America.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. VURSELL. I have two questions I would like to ask the gentleman, who has evidently made quite a study of this matter. First, will the Congress have an opportunity to pass upon the plan?

Mr. MASON. There is a difference of opinion on that. Some claim that this international agreement setting up

this International Trade Organization at Geneva will have to be submitted to the United States Senate for confirmation before it can be approved. Others say that is not so, that the United States Senate and the Congress can be side-tracked. I am not an international lawyer, so I cannot say.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. Under Secretary Clayton made the flat statement to us on the Ways and Means Committee that he would submit that to the Congress of the United States. I think that is something that we must take him at his word on.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The administration is now negotiating 18 reciprocal trade agreements. When they do that they can carry into effect the agreement made over at Geneva, so it will be an accomplished fact, and there will not be any necessity for Congress to pass on the final agreement.

Mr. MASON. That is one viewpoint.

Mr. VURSELL. We have had an experience with our products and with our finances being handled in a great brotherly fashion around the table of many nations through UNRRA, which has been a complete failure. We are outvoted, if there was anyone in UNRRA to vote for us, which I doubt that there has been. We have contributed greatly to the building up of the strength of Russia and her satellite nations at the expense of the American taxpayers.

Here is the question I want to ask: If we go into this thing how many votes will we have or how much control will we have in view of the fact that we are the Nation that will probably suffer the most?

Mr. MASON. Well, I would answer that very bluntly and directly by saying that in this International Trade Organization we would have the same amount of say-so and the same vote exactly in proportion to the rest of the world as we had in UNRRA, and that was very, very small, as the gentleman knows.

Mr. VURSELL. Would we not go on a world free-trade basis, and no doubt find that we had reduced the standard of living in this country through the power of this organization to the detriment of the American people?

Mr. MASON. That is my opinion, and that is why I am opposed to it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I am on the committee with the gentleman from Illinois. I recall appearing before that committee some years ago bewailing the fact that we had transferred from our jurisdiction the protection of our industries to the State Department. I want to ask the gentleman, concerning the condition of all other nations today, as portrayed to us—and in that I am reminded of a

statement I read last year—how can you do business with a poorhouse.

Mr. MASON. Well, of course, we can do business with the poorhouse providing we provide the funds to the poorhouse to do business with us, and that is part of the program.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. I have felt for a long time that this House ought to have a stronger voice in the formulation of the foreign policy of the United States. I introduced in the last session of Congress and also on the opening day of this session a bill that would provide for a select committee of 23 Members of the House of Representatives to make a study and report on the foreign policy of this country, both economically and politically, in every country and every section, and with full power to investigate the State Department and the Foreign Service. In view of what the gentleman has said today, I want to ask him this question: Does he think that such an investigation and study by a special committee of this House would help in formulating a better foreign policy for this country?

Mr. MASON. I certainly do, but I think it is a belated effort. I think it should have been done long ago. But, of course, we could not expect any such resolution as that to go through under the New Deal regime.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OWENS. Aside from the fact that the executive department has emergency powers during wartime, is there any question in the gentleman's mind but that this Congress has the right to make laws and have the executive department enforce them, and that it is about time that we begin to do that in order to save our national policy?

Mr. MASON. Of course, for 150 years that was true, but that has not been true during the last 16 years, because not only has the judiciary department interpreted the laws and said what the Congress should have put in, whether they put it in or not, but our executive departments have been interpreting the laws to suit themselves, and the business of the Congress today is quite largely the vetoing of department rulings which misinterpret the laws, and even vetoing some of the rulings of the Supreme Court on the laws that we have passed.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. I could not keep track of all the items the gentleman had numbered, but I noticed one of them. He referred to the Morgenthau plan and to Mr. W. L. Clayton, Assistant Secretary of State, in connection with it. I do not understand that Mr. Clayton ever subscribed to the Morgenthau fiasco.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Clayton never subscribed to the Morgenthau fiasco, and the Morgenthau fiasco was discarded by

the executive department of this Government after it had been adopted, because it proved so unworkable.

Mr. RANKIN. I understood that Mr. Clayton—whom I know quite well; we came from the same town—stated to the committee that whatever agreements were made should come back to Congress for ratification; at least, to the Senate.

Mr. MASON. He did this on this International Trade Organization. He said he would submit that to the Senate for approval before it would go into effect. He said, however, that as to the 18 reciprocal trade agreements which they expect to put into effect before this International Trade Organization is set up, they, of course, would not go to the Senate.

Mr. RANKIN. One or two gentlemen indicated that Mr. Clayton is communistic. I want to say that Will Clayton is as far from being a Communist as any man in America.

Mr. MASON. In my opinion, Mr. Clayton is one of the biggest and soundest businessmen in America today.

Mr. RANKIN. That is the way I feel about him.

Mr. MASON. That is my personal opinion of him.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from a magazine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARENDS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STIGLER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

VETERANS' EMPLOYMENT SERVICE

Mr. STIGLER. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is not on the floor at this hour. I notified his office that I expected to direct my remarks particularly to the appropriation for the Veterans' Employment Service carried in the Labor Department appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STIGLER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I wonder when the gentleman notified the office of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. STIGLER. I did not notify his office until this morning.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STIGLER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. As a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is chairman, I feel that I should remind the gentleman that the gentleman from Wisconsin since the first of the year has been expending his whole energy and all his time, as have the other members of the subcommittee, on the appropriation bill that recently passed the House. I think

the gentleman from Oklahoma, if he expected the gentleman from Wisconsin to be here today, should have given him more notice. After all, the gentleman remembers that the gentleman from Wisconsin, shortly before the bill passed the House, stated that he was quite tired. He is not in his office because he is taking a little rest from the almost 3 months of very hard work he put in on the appropriation bill to which the gentleman from Oklahoma refers.

Mr. STIGLER. May I say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that no one more than I appreciates the diligent effort and the long hours spent by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on that bill, as did the gentleman from Illinois himself.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman will remember that the gentleman from Wisconsin took the floor here one day and talked for an hour without referring to notes, which indicates his knowledge of the subjects dealt with in that bill.

Mr. STIGLER. Yes; and I wish to congratulate the gentleman on his knowledge of the bill. Further, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois that I sought and made every effort to obtain recognition at the time an effort was made to cut off debate. I never had a chance to answer the argument the gentleman made on the floor at that time with reference to the Veterans' Employment Service. Therefore, I feel within my rights in taking the very first opportunity I could get to speak on this subject. I, too, have spent some time since the bill was passed in research work, in getting material which I expect to deliver to the House at this hour.

Mr. Speaker, a challenge was issued by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the Labor Department, on Tuesday, March 26, which cannot go unanswered. In the discussions concerning the Veterans' Employment Service under title IV of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 there were statements made and definitions given that were in some sense harmful to a service whose record in behalf of the veteran is impressive—an old service established following the First World War and continued under the Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933 establishing a nationwide system of public employment offices.

Under the more recent legislative mandate as contained in title IV of Public Law 346, passed in June 1944, Congress declared its intent and purpose unequivocally. It is specifically stated in that act, and I quote:

The Congress declares as its intent and purpose that there shall be an effective job counseling and employment placement service for veterans and that to this end policies shall be promulgated and administered so as to provide for them (the veterans) the maximum of job opportunity in the field of gainful employment.

In order that these policies might be sound and that the USES might be rendered maximum assistance, the Veterans' Placement Service Board was established and there were designated as members of that Board men of recognized administrative ability. The present members

of that Board are: Gen. Omar N. Bradley as Chairman, and Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, and Secretary of Labor Lewis B. Schwellenbach as members.

And mind you, Mr. Speaker, this law was passed without a dissenting vote. As a matter of record, the gentleman from Wisconsin was at that time a Member of Congress. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was a far different thing then to cast an "aye" for a beneficial law in behalf of our fighting men and women. How different from the chorus of "nays" produced the other day at the cracking of a party whip. And what a sad commentary that is on the Republican Party.

The gentleman from Wisconsin boldly stood before this House a few days ago and, perhaps thinking that his words might go unchallenged, defied any Member to justify the continued existence of an expanded Veterans' Employment Service. I made an effort to accept his challenge then, but the gentleman seemingly wanted to cut off all debate after he finished and made his motion that all debate cease. His party having the votes, the motion prevailed. In his brief hour of glory he accused us of failing to read the record—and when I am finished I believe you will agree with me that he must surely have uttered those words with a fervent prayer that none accept his challenge for the record has revealed some very interesting things. When the gentleman issued this challenge he was well within his rights but we cannot be so certain about his reason.

We cannot believe that there was an intent to be pompous, but if so, it was only exceeded by the implied cruelty in threatening a service to veterans which the Nation cannot afford to abandon. The economy that comes to the country at the expense of veterans can be costly indeed. If the pruning knife of false economy is to sever the service of a small organization within the structure of government that is rendering so large a service to the veteran, then this same knife may well slip and stab our economy in a vulnerable place.

It is a mere pittance in the cost of overall government. The Government dollar here buys more than perhaps any other place in our Government—and yet I speak more to the issue involved than the so-called economy.

There have been some rather shaky reasons advanced as to the legal aspects of this expansion. There has not been advanced, however, a single excuse for the cheap and sordid economy that would deprive veterans of their rightful and promised opportunity to be placed in the best job possible. This sort of economy would be on a par with the wretched undertaker who withholds a portion of the embalming fluid in the certain knowledge that it will never be discovered by the bereaved. Rest assured that in 1948 the veterans will know any niggardliness on the part of this Congress in denying them rights which are plainly theirs under the law. If this is a criterion on what is to come on other needed appropriations, we may expect to see a complete break-down of our economic unity. If this is part of the Republican political program written for the 1948 campaign,

then I say we on this side welcome such an issue.

But, now, let us look far back into the record and see what we see, for the gentleman from Wisconsin has demanded an answer and I think those momentarily deluded will be interested in the whole story. If they blush today, let that rest upon their own conscience for I will have rendered service to my people.

The Wagner-Peyser Act of 1933, the basic legislation under which the Veterans' Employment Service and the United States Employment Service operate, provided under section (a) as follows, and I quote:

It shall be the province and duty of the Bureau—the United States Employment Service—to maintain a veterans' service to be devoted to securing employment for veterans * * * establishing and maintaining a system of public employment offices in the several States and the political subdivisions thereof in which there shall be located a veterans' employment service.

Note well those words, Mr. Speaker, for I am now going to quote for this body some pertinent discussions before the House Committee on Labor which held hearings back in 1933 on this particular piece of legislation.

On Thursday, May 18, 1933, Mr. John Thomas Taylor, representing the American Legion, said:

We feel that there should be a separate and distinct service maintained for veterans. It is purely a Federal function. The veteran, particularly the disabled one, suffered his disability or employment handicap as a result of military service.

Mr. Dunn, of Pennsylvania, a member of the committee, said:

In my opinion, we should have at least one such office—

Meaning a Federal office for veterans—in each State and one in each large town of each State of the Union, and I would be willing to vote for five times the amount expended for that purpose at the present time. If these offices are abolished the veterans will be coming to Washington, and that would make an impossible condition for us.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, in these discussions they were referring to the then existing Federal offices—30 in number—located throughout the country to serve exclusively the employment needs of veterans.

The following colloquy is particularly significant:

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Taylor, do you feel that there is a special reason why veterans' employment agencies should be kept open? You feel that the veteran is a case by himself. The opposition to keeping the veterans' employment offices open comes along this line: The veteran could go to the ordinary labor office set up under this bill; but that does not take care of the veteran.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think that the veteran is a Federal charge, a Federal responsibility, due either to his physical or employment handicap caused while in the service.

The CHAIRMAN. Not only that, but many persons would not want to place a disabled veteran in a position. You have to make it known that he is a veteran in search of employment and—

Mr. TAYLOR. There has to be an agency in sympathy with him and his condition.

And so that discussion continued along those lines.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I quote for you the words of the ranking Republican member of that committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH]:

Mr. WELCH. My experience and contact with the veterans' contact bureau in San Francisco, which is headed by Mr. Richard Stillwell, leads me to believe that they have been doing an excellent work, and such is, I believe, the opinion of everybody who knows the work of the bureau. It has been the means of securing employment for untold numbers of veterans. They go to a great extent to assist the veteran. I am told that such is the history of the veterans' employment service throughout the country.

And so on along these lines the discussion continued. Virtually every member of the committee had something to say along these same lines, clear evidence of intent, if ever there could be intent, on the part of a committee drafting an important piece of legislation.

And here, Mr. Speaker, is another interesting colloquy involving Mr. L. S. Ray, speaking for the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

Mr. DUNN. Did anybody ever raise the question of the constitutionality of your law, alleging that it appropriates money for a certain class of persons? Did anybody ever tell you that an attempt will be made on the floor of the House to have the law providing for these offices abolished because it is class legislation?

Mr. RAY. Do you refer to the employment offices?

Mr. DUNN. Yes.

Mr. RAY. I never heard of it.

Mr. DUNN. Be on our guard, because somebody may in the very near future say that this is unconstitutional because it is class legislation, that the United States has no constitutional right to appropriate money for any special class of people.

The CHAIRMAN. Except bankers.

A MEMBER. And officers of the Economy League.

Mr. DUNN. Yes. But I will be for you, constitutional or unconstitutional. I understood you to say that if we should abolish these regional offices it would be a serious mistake.

Mr. RAY. I was discussing the employment offices at that time.

Mr. DUNN. You say that it would not only be a mistake; it would be inhumane.

Mr. RAY. It would be a very serious mistake.

They were speaking of the Veterans' Employment Service. And how fortunate it is, in a way, that only one or two members of that great old committee survived to suffer here the other day the fulfillment of that dire prediction in a burst of oratory from the lips of the gentleman from Wisconsin. How truly painful it must have been to them, having seen another frightful war engulf us and the ranks of our veterans increased from less than 5,000,000 at that time to something approaching 20,000,000 today.

I say to you this afternoon, Mr. Speaker, if the House cuts of the Employment Service budget shall be concurred in by the Senate, the Wagner-Peyser Act will have been, in effect, nullified or repealed and a Federal-State Employment Service will have been destroyed.

Going further, Mr. Speaker, I wonder what the senior statesman of that earlier day, the Honorable Herbert Hoover, thought last week of the actions of his fellow party member from Wisconsin? You will recall, no doubt, that during his term of office Mr. Hoover vetoed a bill similar to the Wagner-Peyser Act which did not contain provision for a veterans' employment service. However, if the gentleman from Wisconsin and his party leadership so soon forget their own promises to the veteran, it should not be expected of them that they would remember the stand taken by the leader of their own party some 16 years ago in vetoing a bill that did not provide for a veterans' employment service—and Mr. Hoover gave that as his principal reason for exercising his veto. The action taken by his party the other day now raises serious question as to his motives.

I have shown you, Mr. Speaker, with what care our predecessors made provision for a veterans' employment service at the community level as part of the Federal operation. They recognized a Federal responsibility even in those days of relatively few veterans. I am told by those in authority who have followed the development of the Veterans' Employment Service that now, for the first time in history, it has approached the expanded operation originally contemplated. That it has done so in accordance with a more recent mandate—under title IV of Public Law 346—is only incidental. We should only be thankful that it has finally been done and that the foresight of those wise old planners of yesteryear is finally bearing fruit.

And now, Mr. Speaker, now that I have laid before you the legal basis for this important agency of government, it would appear appropriate that we look further into the record and find, if we may, the reason for this sudden defection on the part of the gentleman from Wisconsin. And sudden it was, for it was less than a year ago that the gentleman as a member of his present committee supported an appropriation for the expansion of the Veterans' Employment Service. And it was not so long ago that he was lauding the virtues of our fighting men as they held the enemy from our shores. If the gentleman questioned the moral or legal basis for this meager service to our veterans, why did he not a year ago raise the question he now raises under the guise of economy? I cannot conjecture as to why he did not then raise the issue, but I think the record reveals some startling reasons for his raising it at this time, and economy does not have a thing to do with it.

I deeply regret the necessity for presenting these facts, but the gentleman asked for it in no uncertain terms, so here it is. Here is what the gentleman said on Thursday, May 23, 1946, as a member of this same committee considering appropriations for the Veterans' Employment Service. This is taken from the official report of those hearings:

Mr. KEEFE. I want to say this. I have received innumerable complaints from veterans and from others, that they go to the office here in the District of Columbia and to other offices seeking jobs, and they are

asked to fill out a card. I do not know the name or the number of the card or the description of it. They are told to sit down and cool their heels; and they sit around and sit around. Men have come to me and said that they have become so disgusted that they just walked out and threw up their hands. I have received such complaints and I know that other Members of Congress have.

Apparently the gentleman did not think that routine service in a local public employment office would be quite enough service for the veteran—or was he speaking for the benefit of his veteran constituents? I believe he was sincere in his desire to see something done for the veteran and I recognize his gesture at that time.

Again, the gentleman made some right pungent statements about the Veterans' Employment Service that same day as Mr. Perry Faulkner, Chief of that agency, was testifying in support of his request for funds to expand his service. The gentleman said, and this is from the committee report:

Mr. KEEFE. I want to see a system established that will perform the service of seeing to it that these veterans are given the service that the Congress intended they should have in this field of employment and job counseling and job placement, and I do not care, as one member of the committee, how it is done.

Again, I commend the gentleman and give him the benefit of doubt and say he must have been speaking in all sincerity. I congratulate him at this late date for his wisdom in supporting an appropriation for the expansion of the Veterans' Employment Service, and that is all the more reason to marvel at his reversal this year. I wonder why?

This may be a bit painful to the gentleman in his position of party leadership, but let us look a little further into the recent record and see what we can find that will shed some light on this chameleonic action of our colleague. The public employment service was returned to State operation last November, and I think it is generally recognized there has been some slight friction between some of the interested State agencies and the Director of the United States Employment Service. That was to be expected.

In this connection we see a new individual on the horizon of strategy. By chance he happens to live in Wisconsin, and somehow he happens to be a rather close personal friend of the gentleman from Wisconsin. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Wisconsin has said that he considers him the most intelligent and competent person he knows.

It seems from the records available, from his public and private utterances, that this gentleman out in Wisconsin has a burning and consuming hatred for the United States Employment Service, the Veterans' Employment Service, and Federal agencies in general. But let us look at the record of the hearings before the subcommittee this year. How different they are under the new leadership. The gentleman from Wisconsin, now chairman of the subcommittee, calls in his old friend from Wisconsin purportedly to testify and speak for the Interstate Conference, which is a body composed of employment-security agencies. His name is Stanley Rector, and early in the

hearings he indicates that he is speaking for the entire membership. Let us look at his testimony and see what his motive really is. There are pages and pages of his testimony regarding the activities of the United States Employment Service, but we are now primarily interested in his role insofar as the Veterans' Employment Service is concerned. There can be no doubt from the report of the committee that he succeeded momentarily in his effort to destroy the United States Employment Service as an effective agency of government.

Beginning on page 350 of the report of the hearing we find a most interesting dissertation under the heading: "Veterans' Employment Service, legal justification for the Service." Imagine if you will, a Member of Congress—chairman of a subcommittee at that, calling in from his State an old friend to testify as to the legality of a Federal agency and to give his own interpretation of existing law. I wonder for what purpose? In the course of his testimony this gentleman from Wisconsin goes into all of the fine details of the Veterans' Employment Service, being very careful at first to avoid an open attack upon its program. As a matter of fact, on page 353 he says:

I am not at all prepared to say that something like this number may not be necessary on either Federal or State pay roll. It is a matter for the Congress and those who advise the Congress who know more about it than I do.

At one point in his testimony—and he was very hard to pin down, Mr. Rector said in reply to a question regarding the staffing of the Veterans' Employment Service, and I quote:

Mr. Rector. I am not prepared to answer at all. It might be necessary to add to it.

Mr. Speaker, this was all very interesting to me, and I am glad that the gentleman from Wisconsin brought it to my attention. If you will read the testimony of this Mr. Rector on pages 356 and 357 of the committee report you will find that he finally is cajoled out into the open. Listen to this:

Mr. ROONEY. You think the Veterans' Employment Service set-up should be federalized rather than under the control of the States?

Mr. Rector. I do not think anything should be federalized.

Certainly an unbiased witness, once you get him out in the open. After some more hedging and back-tracking:

Mr. ROONEY. So, finally, you do think it should be turned over to the States?

Mr. Rector. It is my own opinion.

And now, in the event he should attempt to get out of it, we quote the chairman of the committee as he comes to the rescue of his witness:

Mr. KEEFE. May I interject at this point? The purpose in calling this witness on this particular point was on the question as to the legal authorization for any appropriation under the existing law which is on the statute books.

And so forth. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, this is going far afield and something new in legislative history. If, under the new leadership, we must resort

to calling admittedly prejudiced and biased witnesses who hate anything done by the Federal Government from our home States to advise us as to the meaning and intent of our own laws, I think the people should know about it. Our Federal Government, particularly insofar as it proposes to serve veterans, is too vital to us to permit such tampering with its functions.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STIGLER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I wonder if the gentleman has taken any time to look into the background of Mr. Rector, and look into the basis for the authority upon which he can speak on unemployment compensation matters and on the operation of employment offices.

Mr. STIGLER. I will say to the gentleman that I have not. The only information I have is in a general way which was taken from the record.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. It is very apparent, Mr. Speaker, that this information about Mr. Rector is very general, because if the gentleman will take the time to look into Mr. Rector's record he will find that he is an outstanding man in the United States on the subject of the operation of employment offices and on the operation of unemployment compensation in the various States. I further say to his credit, and in fact to the credit of the State of Wisconsin, you bet, we do not want federalization of that agency or any other agency of the State government and bringing them down here to Washington rather than having them administered at home.

Mr. STIGLER. No doubt, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Rector, may be distinguished in his own line; I am not questioning that at all. But the point that I am trying to make is this, which is something new in legislative history, that the chairman of the subcommittee brings somebody from his own State to tell the Congress whether or not there is some legal basis or justification for the existence of some law which the Congress is called upon to legislate. That is the point I am making.

The gentleman from Wisconsin has implanted his foot upon the prostrate body of the veteran and stamped out a service which is vital to the welfare of the veterans. I hope the gentleman's conscience will not suffer when he reads about and sees thousands and thousands of our heroic veterans trudging our highways and byways in search of employment with no governmental agency to sympathetically administer to their needs.

In defense of his actions, as he prepared to crack the partisan whip to close off the debate he obviously feared, the gentleman from Wisconsin referred to the organizations of veterans as pressure groups. And he told you that they should be ignored as they protest his actions.

Now, this term "pressure groups" is one to conjure with. As the troops under General Pershing met, held, and drove back the Huns, we called them valiant heroes. As the legions of Gen. Omar N. Bradley in the Battle of the Bulge ex-

erted pressure on the enemy we called them gallant fighting men—not vulgar pressure groups—and as they work within their organizations as veterans today they will resent the implications of the gentleman. Already there is a rising tide of bitterness—and it bodes no good for the Nation.

The reason the gentleman can stand with safety in the well of this House and malign the veteran and all those interested honestly in his welfare is because American troops on hundreds of forgotten battlefields were a marvelous pressure group exerting pressure upon the enemy with gun and bayonet, and in many cases their bare hands. Perhaps he does not now appreciate their sacrifices, or maybe appreciating them, he still yields to the pressure of the Republican high command.

If the policies promulgated by the gentleman from Wisconsin are not those of his party, then let the Republican leadership disavow that which he has done. If they are the policies of the Republican Party in Wisconsin, then that is something for the people of that State to pass judgment upon. However, if these policies are to prevail in the Halls of Congress under its present leadership and permeate the minds of the American people, then God save us because no mortal man can.

Let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Senate will make the necessary restorations as they consider this appalling thing that has been done by the lash of the majority. If that be done—and I am sure most of us hope that it will be done—then perhaps we can, by voicing our agreement, salvage some of that which was lost to the American people by an ill-conceived action under the guise of economy just a few days ago.

There is no greater advocate of true economy in Government than myself, but why go on an economic binge where our stalwart defenders are concerned? Let us not commit economic butchery by a cloak of false economy. The Republican leadership needs no advice from me today, but may I say be not deluded, our veterans have grown wiser and have learned to appreciate the benefits of good government—they will not be deceived by these vainglorious attacks upon their rights.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDONOUGH asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HALLECK). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. RAMEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

MR. CONGRESSMAN, YOU ASKED FOR IT

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago in my own home city of Toledo, one of my constituents caught me in a restaurant and held me from 11:30 until nearly 3 o'clock. He had been reading. In fact, when I repeated the incident to a friend of mine, he said, "That so-and-so has been reading. He's been reading a book. It's as clear as the nose on your face, he has been reading."

Well, as a matter of fact he had. He had been reading about the days when Calhoun, Clay, Webster, John Quincy Adams, Andrew Jackson, and a few others were alive and active; all at the same time. In those days, he said to me, there were statesmen. He had also been reading of the days when Lincoln, Seward, Jefferson Davis, Judah P. Benjamin, Salmon Chase, Stanton, Fessenden, and the Blairs were all active. In those days, he said accusingly, we had statesmen. "You Members," he said to me, "ought to be statesmen. You were sent down there to be statesmen. Are you?" I started to answer, but he stopped me. "You are not," he said. He cited Clare Booth Luce, Walter Lippmann, Leo Pressman, Westbrook Pegler, Colonel McCormick, Ralph Ingersoll, and the Readers' Digest to prove that the crying need of the hour is for statesmen.

"You as good as promised," he said, "when you ran for office that you would be statesmen."

I said, "We are! Did we not set a ceiling on the spending in spite of its unpopularity? Have we not said 'No' to the spenders who claim to have bought the last few elections? This is one Congress which is thinking of their country and the next generation—not the next election!"

But I did not get very far. He kept after me, and when the clock had gotten around almost to 3 p. m., I gave up and told him I would try, and did he have any suggestions as to how I should go about it.

"Read, reflect, think," he said. "What is the Congressional Library for? Go there, sit there, study. Keep informed. Learn another language. Map out a program and fight for it, a broad, statesmanlike program. Ignore your mail, telegrams and visitors. Real constituents do not write—they rely on your good judgment."

So, I finally said "Yes." Then he said, as I paid the check, "By the way, Homer, my sister's aunt and her family from Ottawa County are going to be down there week after next. She will be at the Mayflower, and I told them at home to never mind, you would look after her. She wants to see the town and she would like to visit the House in session, and the Senate, too, and Mount Vernon and a few places. She would like to meet the President, but I cannot expect too much of you, so maybe the least said about that the better. Anyway, she will be there 3 days and you and your good wife, I know, will do things up brown."

So I said "Yes" to that, too. Now, what bothers me is how I am going to be a statesman, and at the same time look after his sister's aunt. I also wonder about who is going to pay for it, but the main thing is that I cannot read, reflect, and think, and entertain this lady, who is a very nice lady, at the same time.

Last week I entertained and schooled 42 parents and children. I was most happy to. They inspired me. When all reached the other body the school children on vacation said, "Where are they?" Only two are on the floor while one is making a speech against Lillienthal. I answered, "They are busy in committee or answering their mail."

They answered, "They are not here to answer mail but be statesmen. If they answer mail, they can do that at night." I answered, "They average several hundred letters daily. Most letters require research. Do you not want your letters answered?" Whereupon they said, "They asked for it, did they not?"

One of my devoted friends, and I may add with personal pride that I am proud to call him a devoted friend as well as a constituent, called me by phone the other day. He asked me to do a good deed, which I am happy to do. I was indeed quite weary inasmuch as an irritating delegation had called on me the day before; one of those delegations that stay for 3 hours and want to hear nothing only what they want. They were not from the Ninth Ohio District. They asked questions, but I was unable to answer them because they constantly interrupted an answer just as I would start. After the conference I felt as though there was no marrow in my backbone.

The repercussions of that conference were with me the next morning. When my friend called I told him about these interruptions, and he said, "Well, h—, you asked for it; didn't you?"

I reported the conference to several others, and Members of the House, of course, said, "Well, Homer, a Congressman is here to legislate, not to run errands. Why didn't you have sense enough to allow them 15 minutes and quit; that's what we do." Therefore, Members of the House, my object in this address is to ask, what do we ask for? Approximately a dozen magazines in the country and a majority of the newspapers in their criticism say in substance, "Members of both branches of Congress are a sincere, devoted group of persons. They are interested in good government. They are the hardest-working group of persons we know. However, they are not, as a rule, statesmen, and for one reason. They work too hard. They work too hard at errand-running as well as taking care of individual chores by mail and otherwise, that they deprive themselves of time to study, or are so tired that they cannot study. What does a Congressman ask for?"

In his addresses in a campaign, one speaks of what is needed of government. He aims to point out errors existing and state how the errors will be corrected. However, when he leaves these addresses, he is met by a score of good constituents who say, "Just a personal favor, will you help me on this, will you help me on that?" Most of the requests are proper and the Congressman is able to save folks trips to Washington, secure information, and does things that are right to do. Clare Booth Luce has spoken of the sincerity of the men and women in Congress but she states that they work so hard they are unable to think, then she says, "Folks who are not in public positions have time to think while those who are in public positions it seems have no time to think." Do we just listen to the radio and propaganda and act or do we still think? So many are saying to the Congressman, "Well, you asked for it." After all, what does he ask for and what should he do? Where do the errands stop and statesmanship begin and can

he do both? The reorganization bill sought to cure some of it by a new committee arrangement whereby each member will be on only one committee, yet that committee meets daily. Scarcely any Congressman attends a committee meeting but what his secretary phones him that several are waiting in his office from his home town. Some of these constituents have matters of importance in government. A great many more have to be entertained.

I am well aware, though a lot of people are not, that the death rate among Congressmen is unusually high. It is a hazardous business that we adorn. The "bust up" rate is even higher. By bust-up rate I mean the speed with which Congressmen break down nervously, go bankrupt, and reach that hazy stage where they go around talking to themselves and in nightly wakefulness pick imaginary tufts off the counterpane.

I desire neither to die nor crack up. I am told time and again that we asked for it. And ask for it, we did. However, I do not propose to accept it all complacently. I asked for it and I got it. And my constituents asked for it, and they are going to get it. They are going to get a combination of errand boy and statesman. That is the best I can do. I have read three books since the conversation I referred to 3 weeks ago. That is a book a week. That is pretty high. I do not think Clifton Fadiman does any better.

I do not know that these three books helped a lot. One of them was Lincoln's War Cabinet. Another was a very intriguing volume about Thurlow Weed. A third was entitled "Experiment in Rebellion."

These books, if you please, touched the period when Clay, Calhoun, Webster, and Jackson were bowing out. Lincoln, Seward, Jefferson Davis were coming on stage. These were statesmen all, to hear my friend tell it, and some of them undoubtedly were. But the message that I got out of these three books was that the Congress of those days was liable to error in high degree. It seems to me that both the Union and the Confederate States had at least a dozen chances each to win the Civil War and they kicked them away. How either one of them won is a mystery to me.

There is nothing in the Harding era of the twenties quite equal to the shenanigans of the Weed period, which incidentally ran almost to the 1900's. There is nothing in the Garson-Elliott Roosevelt-Pendergast-John Lewis period quite equal to the high jinks of the southern war profiteers or Simon Cameron from Lincoln's own cabinet. In short, I am impressed by the fact that Congressmen of today are far better men, more honorable, freer from treachery, more devoted to the cause of national safety and progress than were the men, with few exceptions, of the halcyon era when everybody was supposed to be a statesman.

We think of Lincoln as the great emancipator freeing the slaves, preserving the Union, delivering masterpieces in prose poetry. We never hear of him as the man, inflexible only as to the preservation of the Union, trading, compromising, gaining his objective step by step. His

greatness is doubly great to me not only because of his enemies but because of those who supposedly were his friends.

The mistakes these men made were monumental. Their blunders were colossal. And in the more intimate histories of them I find that they too had to look after the business of their clients and had to entertain Aunt Hattie around the Capital.

I reached the conclusion that we are not so bad. I reached the conclusion that we will try as hard as we can to be a statesman and to have a statesmanlike view. We also are going to run errands. We are going to be guided by the principles of our party, by the wishes of my constituents, by my own opinions, and to some extent by the still small voice. I might even say, to a great extent by the still small voice. I pass these comments along to other Congressmen, who I am sure are afflicted as I am. They have a double job to do—to be statesmen and to look after Aunt Hattie. Most of them are incorruptible. Some of them are foolish and given to errors, but on the whole I think they rate pretty high.

I do not know of any easy jobs that are at the same time important. My experience has been that the men who are always doing things are the busy men. The man who says he has not the time often has more time than the busy man ever conceived of anyone having. I feel better because of reading. It did not turn out like my Toledo friend implied it would. I got something else out of those three books. The only thing I am worried about is that we will not be misunderstood. However, I suppose that we asked for that, too. And so as long as I am here, I doff the white plume to my contemporaries, and in a way to myself. That quotation "doff the white plume" I did not get from reading. It is a line in a play, *Cyrano de Bergerac*. *Cyrano* was a great lover—for another man. He also was a ghost writer. I wrote this speech myself, to which remark I presume the ghost writers' union will stand up and declare, "We'll say you did."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PUT TEETH IN THE MONROE DOCTRINE

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, if the Monroe Doctrine is to be enforced, it must be implemented by law. For 110 years it has been one of the cornerstones of our foreign policy.

That part of the doctrine, which is aimed against attempts to destroy the American system of government, and up to now has been and still is of greatest importance to ourselves and recognized by the rest of the world, is its declaration that the United States would consider as dangerous to our peace and safety any attempt by European powers to extend their political systems to any portion of this hemisphere.

At the time when the doctrine was proclaimed, the great powers—and especially the aggressive powers—of Europe were monarchies, while the American Nations were then, and have remained with few and transient exceptions, republics.

During the first hundred years of its existence, the knowledge or belief that the United States would support the Monroe Doctrine, if necessary by force of arms, protected us, as well as these republics, from either European colonization within our or their territories, or European efforts to transplant the monarchical principle among them.

The doctrine was vindicated by force of arms when our troops were sent against the Emperor Maximilian of Mexico, who had been established upon his unstable throne by Napoleon the Third of France, while our own Government was desperately engaged in the War Between the States.

Since that historic episode there has been no similar armed invasion of the Americas, and it must now be assumed that there will be none, so long as the United States remains strong, independent, and true to its traditions and obligations.

Furthermore, the entire group of American Republics has become, under the aegis of the Monroe Doctrine, virtually a regional league of nations pledged to respect and to defend each other's freedom and sovereignty and to promote concord and peaceful commerce among themselves.

We have the Pan American Union to guide and cement friendly and cooperative relations.

We have had the several diplomatic conferences at Montevideo, at Buenos Aires, at Lima, at Habana, and at Mexico City, with their significant results.

We have the Act of Chapultepec by which the pan-American alliance has been formalized, and which has been given global sanction in the Charter of the United Nations.

In its military aspects, therefore, the Monroe Doctrine has been fully and completely established in international law.

Our own interests and our own security now require that the Monroe Doctrine be made a definite, effective, and enforceable part of the domestic laws of the United States.

And an ample basis for this proposed action is to be found not only in the purposes of the Monroe Doctrine, but in the very language of the doctrine itself.

The Monroe Doctrine forbids foreign powers to attempt to extend their systems to this hemisphere.

But colonization and conquest are not the only means by which a prescribed system may be extended.

Such an attempt may be made by corrupting officials, or even a substantial portion of the citizenship of a nation by the use of money or of favors and rewards.

Hitler used that method with some of the quislings and their partisans in his satellite states.

Such an attempt may be made by seducing the loyalties of certain elements of the population—by sedulously substituting in their minds devotion to a system which is utterly alien and hostile to their own.

Hitler used that method too, and so did Mussolini.

Such an attempt may be made by propaganda, both from abroad and within the violated country.

Hitler and Mussolini used that method.

Such an attempt may be made by boring into, or getting control of one or more of our political parties, through underground wire pulling and propaganda, by fomenting or creating political puppet parties and related supporting organizations in the affected nation, and by founding or subsidizing a servile press to further their intentions and efforts.

Hitler and Mussolini used that method.

Such an attempt may be made by planting fifth columns in prospective victim countries, to create dissension and carry on social and industrial sabotage and to precipitate and utilize a revolutionary situation.

Hitler and Mussolini used that method.

These techniques of invasion by subterfuge and of conquest by subversion, by fomenting disunity, weakening by disorganization, creating and stirring up discontent among our people, must not be permitted to occur in the United States.

Since 1934 we in the United States and our neighbors here in the Americas have been increasingly infected by Communist propaganda.

We must protect ourselves from all alien Fascist movements whether they be nazism, fascism, or communism.

Our present laws are insufficient for our defense.

Yet they need not be if we will but apply and enforce the Monroe Doctrine.

For the Monroe Doctrine applies to and forbids any attempts of any European nation to extend to the United States the Communist system today of Soviet Russia, as clearly as it applied to the monarchical and imperialistic systems of other European nations in the past.

The phraseology is unmistakably clear and precise—

"We should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

Reaffirmed as it has been before the United Nations with its Court of International Justice, the Monroe Doctrine is unassailable as belonging to this present day.

Translating the Monroe Doctrine into Federal law by prohibiting, through an act of Congress, foreign nations or their agents from organizing or abetting political parties or committees in the United States or its territorial possessions; from publishing therein subversive or fifth-column propaganda; and from influencing or attempting to influence American legislation or electoral or governmental procedure—this will constitute a strong step in stamping out totalitarianism, communism, or other similar forms of government which now threaten democracy.

Congress should enact a new law which should prohibit the use or employment by any foreign nation, as such, within the United States or any of its territories, of any money or propaganda, oral or

written, for the purpose of influencing or attempting to influence United States citizens and voters to change the American form of government as created and established by the United States Constitution, into a totalitarian, communistic, or any other form of government.

Such legislation should also provide that any foreign nation or any of its agents, employees, or representatives acting for and on its behalf who commits any of the above-mentioned acts is guilty of a hostile act against the United States, equivalent to an act of war, and any individual directly or indirectly engaged in the commission of or participating in any such act as such agent shall be regarded as a public enemy of the United States and treated as such.

Such legislation should further provide that the penalty for the commission of any such act shall be a severe one punishable under some circumstances by death, life imprisonment, or imprisonment for such a lesser period of time, as the court in the exercise of its good judgment, on the facts in any particular case, may consider to be just and proper, and subject as well to a heavy fine in addition to imprisonment.

There may be some cases where the acts committed may be very serious, and other cases where they may not be.

It is wise, therefore, to provide in any such legislation for a large latitude, in which the court will be able to fit the punishment to the crime.

Such legislation should provide further that any foreign nation violating the statute or any of its provisions may be indicted in accordance with due process of law by a grand jury of the Federal district in which the act may be committed and, if found guilty, punished by a fine of \$100,000 or some other substantial amount to be fixed by Congress for each offense, and that in order to enable the Government to collect any such fine or fines, the new legislation should authorize the United States to seize any money or other property located here and owned by such offending foreign nation and apply such money, or sell such property and apply the proceeds thereof to the payment of any fine or fines imposed on such foreign nation. The new legislation should further provide that, within the discretion of any Federal court of the United States, any employee or citizen of such offending foreign nation found guilty of having committed any such act or acts while temporarily or permanently residing in the United States may be deported therefrom on such notice and at such time as any Federal court of the United States may determine.

At present the Monroe Doctrine is merely a national policy.

It is not a part of our statutory or constitutional law.

The enactment by Congress of such legislation as is herein recommended would translate the Monroe Doctrine into law.

There is nothing in our Constitution to prevent Congress from taking such action.

And there would be no infringement whatsoever of the proper rights of persons.

An individual citizen of a European nation has to obtain the right to sojourn within the United States, and if he be legally permitted to come within our borders, he has while here the right to express his own opinion in favor of the people of the United States changing their form of government to such other form that he might advocate.

He would have the right to publish his own ideas in the United States and disseminate them by propaganda or otherwise. The United States Constitution gives him such right as an exercise of personal liberty or freedom of speech. He would have no right to do that, however, as the agent of a foreign nation which used him as its tool to stir up dissension and disorganize our people.

A foreign nation as such has not the right under the Monroe Doctrine to intermeddle in the domestic affairs of the United States or of any of the other republics in the Western Hemisphere. If it were shown that an individual national were acting as the agent of his government by spying or issuing subversive propaganda for the purpose of creating disturbances, disorganization, and disunity in our midst, that would be considered an intermeddling by such foreign nation through such agent in our domestic affairs and would be a violation of the Monroe Doctrine.

Concerning the indictment of such a foreign nation by a Federal grand jury, there is no reason why a foreign nation which is a governmental corporation might not be indicted in the United States just as an individual may. Business corporations are frequently indicted charged with the commission of crimes as corporations. There is no reason why a foreign government as such, which is nothing more nor less than a corporation although it has governmental power, can not be indicted.

If there are any treaties between the United States and any foreign nations which would prohibit their indictment here, such treaties, or the part of them applicable, may be abrogated or canceled by act of Congress.

The Monroe Doctrine should be enacted into law, and enforced. We should urge that all Western Hemisphere nations follow our example.

A BILL TO BE INTRODUCED BY CONGRESSMAN ALVIN E. O'KONSKI ON MONDAY, APRIL 7, 1947, TO ENACT THE MONROE DOCTRINE INTO LAW, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The Criminal Code of the United States of America is hereby amended as follows:

SECTION 1. That the use or employment by any foreign nation within the territory of the United States or any of its possessions subject to its jurisdiction, of subversive activities, or attempts to create discontent, disunity, and disorganization of our society by or through the planting of what are popularly known as fifth columns in the midst of our people, or agents of any kind, or by the use of money to influence political parties, or any of them, or by advocating policies which may result in the overthrow of our form of government and the establishment of a foreign form of government in its place and stead, and the use of money for propaganda consisting of the composition, issuance, utterance, publication, or dissemination of any matter, oral or written, caused to be issued, disseminated, published, or communicated by any foreign nation for the purpose of influencing or at-

tempting to influence our citizens to change our form of government, as created and established by the United States Constitution, is hereby prohibited.

SEC. 2. That any foreign nation or any of its agents, employees, or representatives, for and on its behalf, which or who commits or attempts to commit any of the above-mentioned acts, is guilty of a hostile act against the Government of the United States, and shall be regarded as having committed a crime against the United States, and any individual or foreign nation directly or indirectly engaged in the commission of, or participation in, such an act, shall be regarded and treated as a public enemy of the United States.

SEC. 3. That the penalty for the commission of any of the aforementioned acts by any individual shall be death, life imprisonment, or imprisonment in one of the Federal penitentiaries, prisons, or jails, for such period as, in the discretion of the Federal court in which the defendant shall be found guilty, may be just and proper, and the said guilty person shall also be subject to a fine in addition to such imprisonment of a minimum of \$10,000 for each offense.

SEC. 4. That any foreign nation violating such act or any of its provisions as above herein specified may be indicted in accordance with due process of law, by any grand jury of the Federal district in which any such act or acts has been or may be committed, and if found guilty of the commission of such act or acts shall be punished by a fine of not less than \$100,000 for each offense committed by such nation, and that in order to satisfy any fine or fines imposed thereon, any money or other property owned by said nation within the territory of the United States or any of its Territorial possessions shall be subject to immediate seizure, and in the case of property, whether same be real property or personal property or intangible rights, the same shall be sold in order to obtain the necessary money from the net proceeds thereof to satisfy any fine or fines imposed on such foreign nation, and it is within the discretion of any Federal court of the United States to determine if any citizen or citizens of such offending nation or nations found guilty of having committed any such act or acts, who may be temporarily residing in the United States, may be deported therefrom on such notice and at such times as any Federal court in the United States, in the exercise of its best judgment and discretion, shall determine.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I think the gentleman is doing the Nation a service in reciting these points categorically. I wonder if he intends to recall to the Members of the House the time the State Department was asking for money for an organization like UNRRA for relief, they were refusing aid from individuals and groups in the United States who wished at their own expense and through their own efforts to provide help for their relatives and friends in other countries.

Mr. O'KONSKI. It was not a relief organization. It turned out to be an organization to finance communism in the Balkans and in Europe. If it was not for the money which Tito got through UNRRA, which amounted to \$650,000,000, he would not today have a standing army of 700,000 men threatening the peace of Greece and Turkey because he just would not have had the funds with which to do it. Not only that, but if we had not bolstered the

Communists and Tito in Yugoslavia with \$650,000,000 worth of UNRRA goods very likely today he would not even be a leader in Yugoslavia, because the people would have overthrown him a long time ago. The only reason he keeps his power is because he can do so with the power of American money and UNRRA goods and UNRRA food.

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. I wonder if the gentleman remembers during the time that the question of a world bank was being discussed on the floor of the House the statement was actually made in the well of the House that the establishment of that world bank would make it unnecessary to have individual loans to any of the countries.

Mr. O'KONSKI. That is correct.

Mr. RAMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. RAMEY. I have two questions in mind which I intended to get further information on before taking them up with the gentleman, but may I ask the gentleman whether or not to his knowledge the Army is now giving intensive refresher courses in both the Greek and Turkish languages at the Pentagon Building on the assumption, of course, that through the propaganda agencies this bill is going to pass easily?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I understand they are. That program was started long before the message was brought to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RAMEY. Has the gentleman received any guaranty that if the troops and other people are sent with money that the 6,000 bulldozers that are rusting and which are ready for agriculture will be greased up and put into agricultural work to help rebuild those countries, or will we be warlike and forget about these bulldozers?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I think the gentleman and I agree on that point perfectly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman know any way that we can make some gentlemen in the other body who were elected on the Republican ticket read what you are saying? I would like to get them to do it.

Mr. O'KONSKI. What I have to say about gentlemen of the other body cannot go in the Record.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes on Thursday next, after the completion of the regular business of the day and other special orders heretofore entered for that day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Wednesday, April 9, 1947, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

516. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Boiler Inspection Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

517. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of E. J. Brennan and Janet Howell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

518. A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a tabulation showing the number of envelopes, labels, and other penalty inscribed material on hand and on order June 30, 1946; the number of pieces procured; the estimated mailings; and the estimated cost by departments and agencies for the period July 1 to December 31, 1946; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

519. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a copy of the audit report of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation for the period July 1, 1943, to June 30, 1944, together with a copy of the statement of the Acting Manager of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, filed by the Secretary of Agriculture on February 10, 1947; to the Committee on Agriculture.

520. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the detention, care, and treatment of persons of unsound mind in certain Federal reservations in Virginia and Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

521. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Mr. Alfred Thomas Freitas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

522. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting pursuant to section 16 of the Organic Act of the Virgin Islands of the United States, approved June 22, 1936; one copy each of various legislation passed by the Legislative Assembly of the Virgin Islands, the Municipal Council of St. Croix, and the Municipal Council of St. Thomas and St. John; to the Committee on Public Lands.

523. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the report on co-operation of the United States with Mexico in the control and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease; to the Committee on Agriculture.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. First intermediate report filed pursuant to Public Law 486, Seventy-ninth Congress, on the effectiveness of the antiracketeering laws and the administration thereof; with amendment (Rept. No. 238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 2962. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Pony Express National Monument; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H. R. 2963. A bill to create a United States Academy of Foreign Service; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 2964. A bill providing for the conveyance to the regents of the University of Texas of that portion of the San Antonio Arsenal determined to be surplus to the needs of the War Department; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MICHENER (by request):

H. R. 2965. A bill to insure further the military security of the United States by preventing disclosures of information secured through official sources; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2966. A bill to amend the Administrative Procedure Act to authorize commissioned officers of the Coast Guard to preside at the taking of evidence in proceedings under section 4450 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2967. A bill to authorize certain administrative expenses for the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIMPSON of Illinois:

H. R. 2968. A bill to provide for emergency flood-control work made necessary by floods occurring in 1947, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 2969. A bill to grant to the State of California a retrocession of jurisdiction over certain rights-of-way granted to the State of California for the purpose of widening and extending the right-of-way constructed in the Presidio of San Francisco Military Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 2970. A bill to provide for the review of the cases of officers removed from the Regular Army pursuant to section 2 of the joint resolution of July 29, 1941 (55 Stat. 606), and for their restoration if justified; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. R. 2971. A bill to provide for the acquisition of the hospital at Camp White, Medford, Oreg., for use as a domiciliary facility by the Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER of Connecticut:

H. R. 2972. A bill to amend section 201 of the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 2973. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. R. 2974. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2975. A bill to exempt from tax the transportation of persons on boats used for fishing purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 2976. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to authorize the issuance of public improvement bonds of the Territory during the years 1947 to 1951, inclusive, without regard to the limitations imposed by the Hawaiian Organic Act; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to exercise a policy of moderation and of careful

and deliberate consideration of all pending and proposed measures seeking to restrict or deny rights of members of organized labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to restore the salmon industry to its former productivity; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to restore to the Bureau of Customs the funds cut from its 1947-48 appropriations by the National House of Representatives; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation appropriating funds to continue the Rural Electrification Administration and provide funds for loans to rural electric cooperatives; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to support Senate bill No. 715; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to ratify a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America relating to the term of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to continue the horse-breeding program of the Remount Service of the Quartermaster Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to pass legislation for the immediate cash payment of GI terminal leave pay; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to ratify the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the terms of office of the President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact House bill 577 or similar legislation; to the Committee on Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. PETERSON introduced a bill (H. R. 2977) for the relief of Lloyd Barnet, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

302. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition of 95 residents of the community of Bowerston urging the passage of legislation to prohibit alcoholic beverage advertising; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

303. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Department of California, Blue Star Mothers of America, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opposing all subversive and un-American actions in our Nation; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

304. Also, petition of Mr. M. E. Rothget and others, petitioning consideration of

their resolution with reference to opposition to the 1-cent increase in the local gasoline tax; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

305. Also, petition of Mrs. Marie A. Wood and others (members of Townsend Club No. 22, of Miami, Fla.), petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social-security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

306. Also, petition of Mrs. F. B. Turner and others (the Fourth Congressional District Townsend Council of the State of Florida), petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the proposed social security legislation known as the Townsend plan, introduced in the Eightieth Congress as House bill 16; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, March 24, 1947)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and eternal God, Thou who alone knowest what lies before us this day, grant that in every hour of it we may stay close to Thee. Let us today embark on no undertaking that is not in line with Thy will for us here, for our country and our world. Bestow Thy grace upon the Presiding Officer, the Members, and the servants of this body. Illumine our minds and direct our thinking, that our thoughts and our actions may merit Thy blessing. For our Lord Christ's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHITE, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the legislative proceedings of Monday, April 7, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

PENALTY MAIL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report showing the quantity of penalty-inscribed mail on hand or on order June 30, 1946, the number of pieces procured, estimated mailings, and estimated cost of handling for the period of July 1 to December 31, 1946, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; ordered to lie on the table:

"Senate Joint Resolution 12

"Joint resolution relative to memorializing the Congress of the United States to support Senate bill 715, providing retirement benefits for the investigatory staff of the Federal Bureau of Investigation

"Whereas the investigatory staff of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, under the sterling leadership of J. Edgar Hoover, has achieved an enviable and remarkable record of efficiency, success, and heroism in its relentless war against crime and espionage, thereby earning the gratitude and esteem of the entire Nation; and

"Whereas this present high standard in criminal investigatory activities is endangered through the numerous resignations of experienced agents of the Bureau to accept positions with attractive security features in private industry; and

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States Senate bill 715, which amends the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended, to provide liberal annuities for the investigatory personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who have rendered at least 20 years of service; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has previously enacted legislation providing retirement benefits for representatives of the Foreign Service of the State Department, and numerous State and local police agencies provide similar benefits for their personnel: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly). That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully memorialized to support Senate bill 715 of the Eightieth Congress, first session, to the end that the purpose therein sought to be accomplished may be enacted into law; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of California."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"Senate Resolution 68

"Resolution relative to continuing the horse-breeding program of the United States Army

"Whereas during the last 25 years, the United States Army, through the Remount Service of its Quartermaster Corps, has carried on a horse-breeding program by making available to livestock growers in various parts of the United States the services of selected stallions for breeding purposes; and

"Whereas this program has resulted in a very great improvement in horses produced throughout the United States, particularly in the Western States, including California, where the growing of livestock is an important part of the economic life of the country; and

"Whereas it is highly desirable that the best possible breeds of horses be developed to meet the growing demand for better stock for general use as well as for recreational purposes, the latter use developing constantly and so popular that a program is under way to develop a whole system of riding and hiking trails throughout the State of California; and

"Whereas the program of horse breeding carried on by the United States Army is far too extensive to be maintained by any private breeders or organization of livestock growers, and the discontinuance of the program will result in a deterioration of quality of horses produced in the United States, which will in turn result in great economic